DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 330 024 EA 022 552

AUTHOR	Kallen, Dennis
TITLE	Coordination of Education Policies with Policies in Other Fields: A Synthesis. Reports, Studies Working Series No. S.139.
INSTITUTION	United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, Paris (France). Div. of Educational Policy and Planning.
PUB DATE	88
NOTE	36p.; Study prepared as part of the documentation for the 1989 International Congress on Educational Planning and Management.
PUB TYPE	Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120)
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Cooperation; *Educational Policy; Elementary Secondary Education; Foreign Countries; *Interdisciplinary Approach; Organizational Change; Organizational Objectives; Policy Formation; Politics of Education; *Regional Cooperation; Shared Resources and Services
IDENTIFIERS	*UNESCO

ABSTRACT

Issues pertinent to the coordination of educational policies with those in other fields for innovative policy formation are presented in this synthesis. The first section details objectives of the interdisciplinary approach, of which the development of common frameworks and methodological tools that are adaptable to specific countries or regions is primary. The second section discusses concepts and theories, pointing out that the interdisciplinary approach links theory and practice and is systemically oriented. The impact of political and administrative structures on policymaking structures and distribution of power in different countries is examined in the third section, and policies and programs are discussed in the fourth section, which cautions that coordination with other policymaking sectors may create overlap between educational systems. Section 5's analysis of the political context of power and decision making identifies barriers to coordination, such as deficient information dissemination in developing countries, shortened implementation stages, and a gap between educational policy and practice. Lessons to be learned are discussed in the final section; these include attention to accountability and political legitimacy of policy coordination. Conclusions point to Unesco's instrumental role in policy coordination and the need to consider such factors as the divisive effects of policy coordination, life cycles of the policy process, demography, and levels of development. (22 references) (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Reports
Studies...

S.139

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sabatini

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CO-ORDINATION OF EDUCATION POLICIES WITH POLICIES IN OTHER FIELDS

A SYNTHESIS

Dennis KALLEN

EA 022 552

Division of
Educational Policy
and Planning

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Unesco, Paris

CO-ORDINATION OF EDUCATION POLICIES WITH POLICIES IN OTHER FIELDS

A SYNTHESIS

Dennis KALLEN

This paper has been prepared as a supportive study for the preparation of the documentation for the International Congress on Educational Planning and Management planned for 1989 (Document 24C/5, para. 04112)

The opinions expressed in this document are those of the author and do not necessarily represent the views or policies of Unesco.

Les idées exprimées dans ce document sont celles de l'auteur et ne reflètent pas nécessairement celles de l'Unesco.

Contents

Part I

Summary 1

Résumé 3

Part II

1. Objectives of intersectoral co-ordination and integration 7

2. Defining concepts and outlining the theoretical framework 10

3. Methods, models and techniques 14

4. Policies and programmes 20

5. Power and decision-making: the political context 25

6. Experiences gained and lessons learned 26

Conclusions 28

Reference and background documents 29

Part I

Summary

1. Objectives

The need to co-ordinate education policies with those in other fields is expressly recognized in Unesco's programme, in particular co-ordination with scientific and technological and culture and communication policies.

Education should also be co-ordinated with national development plans, the latter conceived in close relationship with overall socio-economic and cultural development policies.

Co-ordination entails interdisciplinarity, with specialists from the relevant disciplines working together; it also implies working towards the development of common conceptual frameworks and common methodological tools. This does not mean that one single theory or method must result; theoretical and methodological thinking must reflect specific contextual conditions prevailing in regions, countries and different sub-national levels. The challenge is to develop appropriate theories and models while looking for common patterns allowing comparison, exchange and co-operation.

At sub-national levels, incentives for policy and planning co-ordination and integration are stronger and more tangible than at the national level. With rare exceptions, important decisions are taken centrally; regional and local power relate on the whole to the implementation or to relatively minor issues and too much stress on policy co-ordination at these levels may be counterproductive.

The objectives of policy co-ordination are as many as there are policies and policy decisions. Objectives and legitimacy are often confounded. Objectives often assigned to co-ordination are greater efficiency in attaining policy objectives and a more rapid response to external challenges. 'Efficiency' relates sometimes to internal efficiency (better use of resources, less bureaucracy, prompter decision-making, ability to make the necessary 'hard choices', promotion of long-term and encompassing policy-thinking), sometimes to external efficiency (the degree at which objectives are attained). In times of economic hardship, policy co-ordination is expected to enhance the internal efficiency of the policy-making process and bureaucracy.

Trying to define the objectives of policy co-ordination is an unproductive exercise. Co-ordination and integration are 'techniques' at the service of planning and policy-making, but their side-effects, such as the development of shared frames of thinking or a spirit of co-operation and willingness to compromise for the common good often supersede the original objectives. Co-ordination may thus create a profound change in mentality. Authority may be required to initiate this process, but in the long run it requires consensus as to objectives and as to working methods.

2. Concepts and theories

It follows that the precise meanings of 'co-ordination' and 'integration' can only be determined in the light of the specific political, administrative and social context in which the terms are used. Thus they have varying connotations according to whether we are looking at countries with planned economies or those with market economies.

Goals for policy co-ordination range from very ambitious to very modest. The current practice in most countries corresponds on the whole to the more modest concept. Much of it hardly deserves the term 'co-ordination'. Minimum co-ordination may be tantamount to 'subordination' of one sector to another, as is often the case with the adaptation of educational policy to economic requirements.

Frequently means and ends are confounded, owing to the difficulties of defining criteria for the success or failure of co-ordination. The temptation to consider co-ordination successful once the administrative structures for consultation between several sectors of policy-making are in place.

The definition of techniques and methods for policy co-ordination meets with similar difficulties. There seem to be as many techniques and methods as there are cases and programmes.

The theoretical basis of policy co-ordination is derived from theories about policy-making which gradually moved from rigid rationalism towards acknowledging the role of incidental and human and personal factors in policy-making. From 'muddling through' to 'incrementalism', the awareness has grown of the need to accommodate these 'irrational' factors in a new theoretical construct. Much remains, however, to be done in this domain, all the more as in most developing countries the rationalistic paradigm still finds many adepts.

The concept of interdisciplinarity may offer a way out of theoretical difficulties, allowing as it does the linking of theory and practice and an approach to social systems as a whole, as opposed to the piecemeal approach of sectoral policy-making.

In the reality of policy-making and policy co-ordination, a shift can be noticed from central decision-making to implementation and from the macro to the meso and micro-levels. This trend runs parallel to a shift from policies based on 'integration at the point of delivery' to policies that rest on 'integration at the point of consumption'. Parallel to this, a trend can be noticed to assign a greater role to the private sector, to the detriment of the public. These developments raise intricate problems of guaranteeing what were hitherto considered essential social values.

3. Structures

The political and administrative structures of co-ordination reflect in general the overall policy-making and administrative structures and existing distribution of power. In both developed and developing countries, economic and finance-budgeting ministries dominant. In many developing countries, they share their power with external public and private financing agencies and corporations. The importance of the private sector is growing, including in education where it has virtually full control over large sectors of educational hardware and software.

Education policy in many developing countries covers a very large range of responsibilities, extending to the cultural domain, while sub-national administrations in most have little political power in education.

The need for co-ordination of sectoral policies is strongly felt in all countries, but in developing countries it is of more recent origin, often not well articulated, and its legitimacy often derives from pressure from external financing agencies.

In many developing countries, particularly in Africa, the 'self-reliance' concept serves as a unifying principle to which education policy is in theory subordinated. But there is often a wide gap between statements and reality, and sectoral policies are frequently insufficiently articulated to provide a sound basis for policy co-ordination.

Efforts for policy co-ordination are in most developing countries confined to co-ordination between central administrations. Special committees, institutions and other ad hoc structures are usually in charge, under the aegis of the Prime Minister's Office. In Asian countries, spontaneous co-ordination at the level of policy implementation or co-ordination at decentralized and project levels can be found. The regional/provincial level of administration often appears to be the weak link in overall co-ordination.

4. Policies and programmes

Considerable efforts have been made in most developing countries to adapt education to developments in other sectors - the economy first, then science and technology and, more recently, communication. But co-ordinating education with the more advanced developments in science, technology and communication has often resulted in the creation of new institutes and programmes outside the mainstream of education.

The economic crisis has enhanced the pressure for adapting education to economic requirements, but the immediate effects have been cushioned by the momentum that education has gained as well as by incessant demographic pressure. Nevertheless, public support for education with no immediate economic relevance is waning.

Many arrangements for co-ordinating education with other policy-making sectors have been put in place and many successful efforts are reported. Many of these do not deserve the term 'co-ordination'; they are one-way adaptations, usually decided from the top without consultation with those directly concerned.

The need to co-ordinate education with cultural policies is in most developing countries fully accepted. But the overlap is such that there is little place for co-ordination in the true sense of the word. Policies centre mostly on the strengthening of national language(s) and on support for popular and professional art.

Equally, the need for co-ordination with communication policies is fully understood, but the breakthrough of modern communication systems in most developing countries is only just beginning and co-ordination has not yet taken precise form. There is much to be said in the present situation for special and ad hoc co-ordination projects in this sector if the required level of competence is to be guaranteed.

Co-ordination of education with science and technology is given top priority in most developing countries. Policies aim both at the overall education system and at the creation of special high-level programmes. Often both efforts run parallel, creating the risk of two-track systems. Furthermore, the existence of co-ordinating

mechanisms does not always guarantee that co-ordination is attempted.

5. Power and decision-making: the political context

Information is certainly the weak link in most developing countries' policies. Parallel to a growing pressure and need for better information systems in policy-making, dependence on external hardware and software has grown exponentially.

Another relevant trend is the shortening time-perspective within which policies operate. Education has been less affected than other sectors. For policy co-ordination, this raises intricate problems, well-known to educational planners.

This growing discrepancy manifests itself also in an increasing gap between education policy and planning on the one hand and educational practice on the other. It weakens the position of central policy and planning to the benefit of sub-national levels where the adaptation to the time-perspective of other sectors is easier. It appears that central educational administrations in many developing countries are not fully aware of these developments and risk losing their grip on reality.

6. Experience gained and lessons learned

Evaluation, an indispensable element of policy co-ordination, is fraught with enormous methodological difficulties and political blocks. As a result, most co-ordination efforts are not evaluated. Worse, the need for evaluation is often not acknowledged.

Policy co-ordination cannot ignore the growing public demand for 'accountability', a demand reinforced by economic and budgetary stringency. Not responding to it is tantamount to suicide.

Much is said for scientifically and methodologically less demanding evaluation of policy co-ordination. Only thus can the demand be met, given the state of the art of policy evaluation.

Careful attention must be given to the political legitimacy of policy co-ordination. The momentum of central bureaucracy and its inherent capacity for recuperation are such that any co-ordination may become a costly but ineffective tool in the hands of bureauracies preoccupied with self-preservation.

The tension between technical competence and broad participation is related to the above. The claim that at the sub-national levels less competence is needed deserves close scrutiny. Similarly, the inclusion of the 'human' and 'irrational' factors in policy-making is tempting, but methodologically and politically dubious.

Conclusions

A tangible conclusion from the available reports on policy co-ordination is that exchange of experience, perhaps in the form of networking, is a first imperative. But such exchange is in the present 'state of the art' not feasible. The methodological and theoretical conditions for such an exchange and for the underlying reporting and evaluation must be created. It is thought that Unesco can be instrumental in this respect.

A second conclusion is that exchange between developing countries promises to be more fruitful than between developed and developing countries.

A third conclusion pertains to education's present position on the policy- making scene. The pressure for co-ordination with other sectors may result in weakening education's position and in distracting it from part of its essential mission.

A plea is made for paying more attention to the problem of differences in time-dimensions among several sectors of policy-making, as well as between national and sub-national levels. Parallel to this, it is thought that co-ordination should be situated at a particularly favourable stage in policies' 'life-cycle'.

Finally, it is suggested that the demographic factor, in view of its determinant role in most developing countries' educational development, be given more attention in policy analysis and co-ordination. A more important place could be assigned to genuine demographic policies in overall policy-making and a central place to co-ordination of demographic and education policy.

Résumé

1. Objectifs

La nécessité d'une coordination entre les politiques éducatives et les politiques poursuivies dans d'autres domaines, notamment celui de la science et de la technologie et celui de la culture et de la communication, a été expressément reconnue dans le programme de l'Unesco.

La politique de l'éducation doit elle aussi être coordonnée avec les plans nationaux de développement, eux-mêmes conçus en relation étroite avec l'ensemble des politiques de développement socio-économique et culturel.

Qui dit coordination dit interdisciplinarité, c'est-à-dire collaboration de spécialistes des disciplines concernées et travail d'élaboration de cadres de référence conceptuels et d'outils méthodologiques à usage commun. N'en déduisons pas pour autant qu'il faille tout ramener à une théorie unique ou à une seule méthode ; la réflexion théorique et méthodologique doit refléter les caractéristiques contextuelles propres des régions, des pays et des différents niveaux régionaux et locaux. Telle est d'ailleurs la difficulté : élaborer des théories et des modèles appropriés tout en recherchant des schémas

communs qui permettent les comparaisons, les échanges et la coopération.

Aux niveaux régionaux et locaux, les facteurs qui poussent à coordonner et à intégrer les politiques et la planification sont plus puissants et plus concrets qu'au niveau national. Or, sauf rares exceptions, les décisions importantes sont prises à l'échelon central ; les pouvoirs régionaux et locaux n'ont en général de prise que sur la mise en oeuvre ou les questions d'ordre relativement mineur, et à trop vouloir coordonner les politiques à ces niveaux, on risque d'obtenir le contraire de l'effet escompté.

La coordination des politiques admet autant d'objectifs qu'il y a de politiques et de décisions de principe. Objectifs et participation, souvent, ne font qu'un. Les objectifs fréquemment assignés à la coordination consistent en une efficacité accrue dans la réalisation des buts recherchés et en une plus grande rapidité de réaction face aux défis externes. L'«efficacité» est parfois entendue au sens d'efficacité interne (meilleur emploi des ressources, desserrement des contraintes bureaucratiques, rapidité accrue de la prise des décisions, capacité d'opérer les nécessaires arbitrages, promotion d'une réflexion à long terme de caractère global en matière de politique à suivre) et parfois au sens d'efficacité externe (la mesure dans laquelle les objectifs sont atteints). En période de difficultés économiques, on compte sur la coordination des politiques pour améliorer l'efficacité interne du processus de décision et le rendre moins bureaucratique.

Tenter de définir les objectifs que vise la coordination des politiques est ainsi un exercice stérile. La coordination et l'intégration sont des «techniques» au service de la planification et de l'élaboration des politiques ; mais leurs effets secondaires, tels que la définition de cadres communs de réflexion ou bien la naissance d'un esprit de coopération et l'expression d'une volonté de parvenir à un compromis en vue du bien commun, l'emportent souvent sur les objectifs initiaux. Il arrive ainsi que la coordination crée un profond changement de mentalités. Une intervention autoritaire peut être nécessaire pour lancer ce processus mais, à long terme, ce qu'il exige, c'est un consensus sur les objectifs et les méthodes de travail.

2. Concepts et théories

On ne peut donc déterminer avec précision ce qu'il faut entendre par «coordination» et par «intégration» qu'en référence au contexte politique, administratif et social spécifique dans lequel ces termes sont employés. Ils ont ainsi des connotations variables selon qu'on a affaire à des pays à économie planifiée ou à ceux qui ont une économie de marché.

Les buts de la coordination des politiques vont du très ambitieux au très modeste. On s'en tient dans la plupart des pays à une conception dans l'ensemble modeste. Pour une large part, c'est à peine si elle mérite le nom de «coordination». Elle n'est parfois que minimale, guère plus que la «subordination» d'un secteur à un autre, comme c'est souvent le cas lorsqu'il s'agit d'adapter la politique éducative aux impératifs économiques.

Il n'est pas rare qu'aucune distinction ne soit faite entre les moyens et les fins tant il est difficile de définir les critères qui font la réussite ou l'échec de la coordination. Aussi est-on tenté de considérer la coordination comme réussie dès lors que sont en place les structures administratives de consultation entre plusieurs secteurs faisant l'objet d'une politique nationale.

On se heurte à des difficultés analogues lorsqu'il s'agit de définir les techniques et les méthodes de coordination des politiques. Il y a, semble-t-il, autant de techniques et de méthodes que de cas et de programmes.

La base théorique de la coordination des politiques est dérivée des théories relatives à leur élaboration qui, peu à peu, se sont écartées d'un rationalisme rigide pour en venir à reconnaître le rôle que jouent en la matière l'imprévu et le facteur humain et personnel. De la «navigation à vue» à la «politique des petits pas», la nécessité de prendre en compte ces facteurs «irrationnels» dans une nouvelle structure théorique s'est de plus en plus imposée aux esprits. Il reste, néanmoins, beaucoup à faire en ce domaine, d'autant que dans la plupart des pays en développement le paradigme rationaliste continue à trouver beaucoup d'adeptes.

Le concept d'interdisciplinarité est de nature à offrir une issue aux difficultés théoriques dans la mesure où il permet de relier la théorie et la pratique et d'appréhender les systèmes sociaux dans leur totalité à l'inverse de la démarche parcellaire propre aux politiques sectorielles.

Dans la pratique de l'élaboration et de la coordination des politiques, on observe actuellement une tendance à s'écarter de la centralisation des décisions pour se rapprocher du niveau de l'exécution et à passer surtout de la macroperspective vers une meso- et une microperspective. Cette tendance se manifeste parallèlement à une désaffection pour les politiques reposant sur une «intégration au niveau de la fourniture des services» au profit de politiques fondées sur une «intégration au niveau de la consommation». Parallèlement encore se dessine une tendance à assigner un plus grand rôle au secteur privé, au détriment du secteur public. Ces évolutions soulèvent des problèmes complexes touchant à la sauvegarde de ce qui était considéré jusqu'ici comme des valeurs sociales essentielles.

3. Les structures

Les structures politiques et administratives de la coordination sont en général le reflet des structures décisionnelles et administratives centrales et de la répartition du pouvoir. Dans les pays développés

comme dans les pays en développement les ministères dominants sont ceux de l'économie et des finances. Dans beaucoup de pays en développement, ils partagent leur pouvoir avec des institutions et des sociétés de financement extérieures publiques et privées. L'importance du secteur privé va croissant, y compris dans le domaine de l'éducation où il domine presque complètement des secteurs entiers de la production et de la conception des matériels didactiques.

Cependant, un vaste domaine, qui peut toucher jusqu'à la culture, relève, dans de nombreux pays en développement, de la politique de l'éducation ; quoique, à l'échelon régional et local, les pouvoirs territoriaux n'aient guère d'autorité en matière éducative.

Tous les pays ressentent fortement le besoin de coordonner les politiques sectorielles, mais dans les pays en développement cette nécessité, apparue plus récemment, est souvent insuffisamment exprimée et fréquemment justifiée par la pression qu'exercent les organismes de financement extérieurs.

Dans de nombreux pays en développement, notamment d'Afrique, c'est souvent le concept d'«autosuffisance» qui constitue le principe unificateur auquel la politique de l'éducation est théoriquement subordonnée. Mais souvent aussi, il y a loin des déclarations aux réalités et il est courant que les politiques sectorielles ne soient pas assez clairement définies pour constituer une bonne base de coordination.

L'effort de coordination des politiques se limite dans la plupart des pays en développement à la coordination entre les administrations centrales. La charge en incombe en général à des comités spéciaux, des institutions spéciales et autres structures ad hoc, fonctionnant souvent sous l'autorité du cabinet du Premier ministre. Dans les pays d'Asie on rencontre une coordination spontanée en ce qui concerne la mise en oeuvre ou la coordination des politiques au niveau des structures décentralisées et des projets. Pourtant l'échelon régional/provincial de l'administration se révèle être souvent le maillon faible de la coordination globale.

4. Politiques et programmes

Des efforts considérables ont été faits dans la plupart des pays en développement pour adapter l'éducation aux évolutions qui ont lieu dans d'autres secteurs - d'abord l'économie, puis les sciences et la technologie et, plus récemment, la communication. Mais la volonté de mettre l'éducation en phase avec les plus récents progrès de la science, de la technologie et de la communication a souvent conduit à créer de nouveaux instituts et de nouveaux programmes situés en marge du système officiel de l'enseignement.

La crise économique a accentué la volonté d'adapter l'éducation aux impératifs de l'économie, mais les effets immédiats en ont été amortis à la fois par la dynamique propre qu'a acquise l'éducation et par une pression démographique qui ne se relâche pas. Quoi qu'il en soit le soutien apporté par les pouvoirs publics aux programmes éducatifs qui sont sans rapport immédiat avec l'économie est en cours de regression.

Quantité de systèmes de coordination de la politique de l'éducation avec celle d'autres secteurs où s'exercent l'action des pouvoirs publics ont été mis en place et les réussites signalées sont nombreuses. Beaucoup de ces systèmes, cependant, ne méritent pas d'être qualifiés de systèmes de «coordination» ; ce sont des arrangements à sens unique, décidées en général au sommet sans consultation des principaux intéressés.

La nécessité de coordonner la politique éducative et la politique culturelle est totalement admise dans la plupart des pays en développement. Mais en la matière le chevauchement est tel qu'il n'y a guère de place pour une coordination au vrai sens du terme. Les politiques tendent surtout à fortifier la (les) langue(s) nationale(s) et à soutenir l'art populaire et les arts en général.

De même a été parfaitement compris le besoin d'une coordination avec les politiques suivies en matière de communication, mais la percée des systèmes modernes de communication est à peine amorcée dans la plupart des pays en développement et la coordination n'a encore pris aucune forme précise. En l'état actuel des choses, il y aurait beaucoup à faire dans ce secteur en matière de projets spéciaux et ad hoc pour garantir le niveau de compétence indispensable.

La toute première priorité a été attribuée, dans la plupart des pays en développement, à la coordination de l'éducation avec la science et la technologie. Ces politiques visent aussi bien l'ensemble du système éducatif que la création de filières spéciales de haut niveau. Les deux démarches sont souvent poursuivies parallèlement, ce qui comporte le risque de création d'un système à deux vitesses. En outre, l'existence de mécanismes de coordination ne signifie pas nécessairement qu'il y ait une réelle tentative de coordination.

5. Le pouvoir et la prise de décisions : contexte politique

L'information est certainement le maillon faible des politiques de la plupart des pays en développement. Alors que de meilleurs systèmes d'information au service des instances responsables des choix sont de plus en plus nécessaires et demandés, la dépendance à l'égard des matériels et des compétences d'origine étrangère s'est parallèlement accrue de manière exponentielle.

Une autre tendance ici sensible est que les politiques s'établissent avec des horizons de plus en plus rapprochés. L'éducation en est moins affectée que d'autres secteurs. Cela pose cependant de difficiles problèmes de coordination, bien connus des planificateurs de l'éducation.

Il y a là un hiatus de plus en plus net qui se

manifeste aussi par un décalage croissant entre politique et planification de l'éducation, d'une part, et les activités éducatives proprement dites, d'autre part. La position des instances centrales de planification et de décision s'en trouve affaiblie tandis que se renforce celle des niveaux régionaux et locaux qui ont plus de facilité à s'adapter aux horizons que se sont fixés dans les temps les autres secteurs. Il semble bien que dans de nombreux pays en développement l'administration centrale de l'éducation n'ait pas pleinement conscience de ces évolutions et risque de ne plus avoir prise sur la réalité.

6. Les leçons de l'expérience

L'évaluation, indispensable à la coordination des politiques, se heurte à d'énormes difficultés sur le plan méthodologique et à des blocages d'ordre politique. Aussi, les actions de coordination ne font-elles généralement l'objet d'aucune évaluation. Chose plus grave, la nécessité de l'évaluation est rarement reconnue.

La coordination des politiques ne peut pas méconnaître le fait que l'opinion exige de plus en plus des «comptes», une exigence que renforce encore les difficultés économiques et budgétaires. Ne pas y répondre équivaut à un suicide.

On pourrait discuter d'une évaluation de la coordination des politiques qui soit moins exigeante du point de vue scientifique et méthodologique. Cela paraît le seul moyen de satisfaire l'opinion publique en l'état actuel des techniques d'évaluation des politiques.

Il faut être très attentif à la légitimité politique de la coordination des politiques. La force interne de la bureaucratie centrale et sa capacité de récupération sont telles que toute coordination risque de devenir un outil coûteux et inefficace entre les mains de bureaucraties soucieuses de leur propre perpétuation.

La tension entre le besoin de compétence technique et celui d'une large participation est liée à ce qui précède. L'assertion selon laquelle un moindre degré de compétence est suffisant aux niveaux régionaux et locaux mérite d'être étudiée de près. De même, la prise en compte du facteur «humain» et du facteur «irrationnel» dans le choix des orientations est une démarche tentante, mais douteuse du point de vue méthodologique et politique.

Conclusions

Une conclusion qui s'impose à la lecture des rapports qu'on possède sur la coordination des politiques est que la priorité revient à instituer l'échange d'expériences, éventuellement à travers un réseau organisé. Or, en l'état actuel des possibilités, un tel échange n'est pas praticable. Il faut créer les conditions méthodologiques et théoriques de l'échange et celles afférentes des comptes rendus et de l'évaluation. L'Unesco pourrait, semble-t-il, jouer à cet égard un rôle efficace.

Une deuxième conclusion est que l'échange promet d'être plus fructueux entre pays en développement qu'entre pays développés et pays en développement.

Une troisième conclusion a trait à la position présente de l'éducation sur la scène où sont décidées les politiques. La pression qui s'exerce en faveur d'une coordination de ce secteur avec d'autre peut aboutir à affaiblir la position de l'éducation et à éloigner en partie celle-ci de sa mission essentielle.

Nous attirons tout spécialement l'attention sur le problème des différences d'horizons dans le temps qui touchent parfois les secteurs faisant l'objet d'une même politique nationale, différence sensible aussi entre le niveau national et les niveaux régionaux et locaux. Parallèlement, nous pensons aussi qu'il faudrait situer la coordination à un moment particulièrement propice du «cycle de vie» des politiques.

Enfin, nous suggérons une meilleure prise en compte du facteur démographique dans l'analyse et la coordination des politiques, cela en raison du rôle déterminant que joue ce facteur dans le développement du système éducatif de la plupart des pays en développement. Les orientations de politique générale pourraient faire plus de place à d'authentiques politiques démographiques et s'axer sur la coordination de la politique démographique avec celle de l'éducation.

Part II

1. Objectives of intersectoral co-ordination and integration

Unesco's *Second Medium-Term Plan (1984-1989)* contains a pragmatic formulation of the legitimation of the co-ordination of education policies with policies in other fields (Programme IV. 1); education planners must today take into account the progress achieved in certain related fields. Thus, for example, modern technology should be incorporated into educational development plans. Programme IV. 1 places education policies within the broader framework of national development plans, the latter being of necessity conceived 'in close relationship with the overall policy for socio-economic and cultural development' (*Technical Consultation . . .*, 1986*a*, pp. 1-2.). There are indeed two compelling reasons for framing educational development plans within a larger context: to guarantee society's cultural and historical continuity and to adjust education to technical, social and cultural change. In other words, achieving a balance between tradition and progress, between continuity and change, co-ordination of policies presumably serving the change and progress purpose.

It is widely assumed that the pace of change in the above-mentioned fields has accelerated and that this in itself requires co-ordination and integration of policy and planning. The possibility that developments in each of these sectors are necessarily placed on different time-scales and that eventually co-ordination resulting in adjusting the slower rates to the faster would be harmful is not even remotely considered. 'Cultural lags' perhaps fulfil a useful role and do not always need bridging.

It is repeatedly stated in relevant Unesco documents that sectoral policies should be adjusted to and indeed subordinate to 'overall integrated development and that for education this is to be achieved by means of 'the design and formulation of [. . .] education in the context of overall integrated development, particularly through the co-ordination of education policies with those for the development of the sciences, technology, culture and communication' (Unesco, 1986, para. 04103.).

Sectoral policies such as education are to serve an over-riding goal and co-ordination of sectoral policies must help to achieve this.

Integrated planning and co-ordination of policies require co-operation between representatives from different disciplines. But the need for *interdisciplinarity* derives primarily from the nature of the new tasks. Integrated development and co-ordinated policy-making require contributions from a variety of disciplines. For education, they include economics, sociology, administrative sciences, educational sciences and (socio)linguistics. Approaches that rely on a single discipline are counterproductive. It is, however, understood that multi and interdisciplinary research serve for the different conceptual bases of theories from these different disciplines . . . to be considered together, but that they should not be artificially merged. The possibility that they are incompatible must indeed be taken into account. Interdisciplinarity is desirable, it is often even necessary, but it must not become the overriding concern that blankets the differences.

Decentralization of decision-making is closely connected with co-ordination of policies, but the link comes in through the back door. Co-ordination and integration, so the argument goes, are often fallacious claims that conceal lack of consensus and the existence of power competing bases at the central level. Co-ordination allows a certain amount of conflict-management and even a limited re-distribution of power and resources, but the basic sources of conflict remain. At decentralized levels of policy-making, the conditions for co-ordination and integration are as a rule more favourable. Ad hoc agreements, minor adjustments and small-scale co-ordinating mechanisms are easier to achieve at this level. Political realism requires that co-ordination and

integration of policy and planning should not be sought at the central level, but rather at the regional and local levels.

The relevant Unesco and national background documents stated emphatically that there is no compelling and overriding theoretical or conceptual framework that applies to all Member States and/or all regions. Equally, no commonly accepted objectives are pursued through the co-ordination of policies or through the integration of planning.

This also applies nationally, but here the terms of reference differ from those prevailing at the international level. Here the stress is more on the divergency of power structure and on the conflict of interests than on theoretical or conceptual differences. Co-ordination should not result in artificially muffling these divergencies. If no genuine consensus can be reached at the central administrative level, it should be attempted at the regional or local level, even if this implies that a restrained target is set; pragmatic ad hoc agreements and minor adjustments represent the core of the issues that are implied in the co-ordinatory efforts rather than a grand national design.

Accepting the arguments presented above leads to a somewhat uneasy preliminary conclusion: co-ordination and integration are relatively easy to achieve at the international and at the subnational levels, where on the whole little political power is invested. At the national level, however, where most of the real decision-making power is invested, co-ordination of policies and integration of planning is much more difficult to achieve. The temptation to favour international and subnational co-ordination to the detriment of co-ordination at the level of national policy-making is therefore to be resisted.

The *time-scale* of co-ordination and integration may be different for each of the three levels, ranging from ad hoc and short term to long term. International involvement with the co-ordination of policies and the integration of planning is by nature more distant and theoretical, relatively remote from actual policy-making and aimed at a long-term perspective. At the national level, policy-making operates within the medium-term and co-ordination must prove its worth within these constraints, even if durable effects might require institutional changes and shifts of competences and of power. Given the present distribution of political responsibilities, sub-national co-ordination is initially concerned with policy implementation and by definition operates within the short term.

The *objectives* of policy co-ordination are manifold. Careful perusal of relevant background reports produces the following list.

A first-echelon formulation refers to increased efficiency in attaining stated policy objectives, 'efficiency' defined as 'optimal' or more efficient use of resources. The claims for policy co-ordination expected to save resources are obviously more strident in times of economic recession or stagnation and/or of budgetary stringency. 'Efficiency' may also refer to the extent to which goals are indeed attained. Co-ordination aims at better goal attainment, enhancing the relevance and quality of education. Thus co-ordination of policies is expected to lead to the harmonization of educational output with new socio-cultural development, with change on the labour market or with scientific and technological progress. The underlying assumption is that education policy alone has proved to be unable to attain this harmonization.

Alternatively, it is argued that the acceleration of the rate of change in other sectors, in particular in science and technology, has widened the gap with education. Intersectoral co-ordination of education policies with other policies will lead to a reduction of the discrepancy. Education is asked to step up its rate of change, beyond its usual leisurely pace.

In the wake of these arguments, education decision-making is often accused of lacking in efficiency and expediency due, among other causes, to its bureaucratic weightiness. In this context, intersectoral co-ordination between education and other fields is sometimes expected to lead to less bureaucracy. New decision-making circuits are created that shortcut the usual bureaucratic machinery. Policy-making, planning and implementation are in these cases often entrusted to one single authority or institution. More often than not these are ad hoc arrangements, and the usual democratic controls are inactivated for efficiency's sake.

In a larger sense, co-ordination of sectoral policies, in particular those of education with other policies, is often advocated as an appropriate means of enhancing the system's ability to make the 'hard' choices that the sector on its own has been unable to make. Co-ordination must bring about a new 'no-nonsense' policy-making to which the policy-makers in many countries are nowadays committed.

An argument in favour of policy co-ordination implicit in the foregoing is that co-ordination can be used as an instrument of enforced conflict-management. Outside expertise, combined with outside pressure, may achieve what in-house negociation alone has not achieved. Such imposed co-ordination runs the risk of simply covering up conflicts and divergencies of interests and the 'hard' choices may not outlast the mandate of their protagonists and may prove difficult to implement.

Co-ordination of policies is sometimes advocated as an instrument that can promote long-term thinking and planning and prepare long-term policy decisions. Long-term policies require clarity about the sense of direction in which society will go or will be going. Changes must be anticipated and alternative scenarios devised. Decision-makers are nowadays faced with a whole host of problems of very different kinds relating to many domains; their analysis needs

input from many disciplines and competences. Only co-ordinated planning and policy-making can do justice to this complexity. Policy-making in times of economic crisis is characterized by stress on long-term policy-making and planning together with the trend to seek ad hoc solutions to the problems at hand. The need for intersectoral co-ordination arises in either case, but the range and type of decisions and the actors and institutions involved differ. Most of the data collection and analysis for long-term policy is carried out by specialized institutions outside the national administrations, whereas the short-term work is done internally.

The growing dependence of national policies on complex international forces over which they have no control raises challenges for which national sectoral policies are often unable to provide adequate answers and provides a strong incentive for policy co-ordination. Consultation and co-ordination in response to these international and worldwide challanges must reach beyond the national borders. Thus increased mobility of graduates, the management of ecological problems and many other such issues require a pooling of competences and administrative repsonsibilities that must be drawn from a variety of sectoral administrations.

Besides arguments in favour of policy co-ordination that refer to the solution of problems of substance, a series of what could be called 'second echelon' arguments appears in the background material.

Thus, for example, the fear is expressed that without co-ordination of education policy with other policy in other sectors, education may become a 'mere spectator' to new societal developments. Educational needs that arise from new technological developments and from newly emerging social and cultural aspirations will eventually more and more often be met by programmes outside the education system.

A new objective for policy co-ordination emerges: it must help educational policy to acquire a new relevance and a new vigour. Terms such as 'really strategic planning' and 'a new profile of the educational planner', the need for a 'new policy' and for a 'new type of decision-maker' whose professional training and profile closely resembles that of business managers, are often used.

Another second-echelon argument is related to the fore-going: co-ordination of policies must bring about co-operation of partners from different administrations and different disciplines in a tightly-knit 'team' with its own 'team spirit'. Once they have learned to work closely together, they will be ready to sacrifice some of their sectoral vested interests to the benefit of the new common cause. 'Thus, a development programme could be said to be integrated if the programme has *served to bring the community together* via a more just and equitable distribution of resources and wealth.' (Technical Consultation . . ., 1986*a*, para. 10.3.).

This quote refers to development projects under the aegis of the United Nations, but in the background documentation the criterion of 'bringing the community together' appears also for co-ordination of policies in general. The quote adds, however, an important element; it is via 'a more just and equitable distribution of resources and wealth' that the community is brought together.

The aim is indeed set very high, perhaps too high. Furthermore, there is a certain confusion between means and ends. Admittedly, the quotation refers to integration and not to co-ordination and it probably defines what earlier in the same paper is indicated as being the most far-reaching of three types of integration, '*integration* of units from different sectors, eventully merging their values and goals, including the development of a common structure of weights attached to these goals and merging their missions and resources' (Technical Consultation . . ., 1986*a*, para. 9.1(c).)

On the other hand, this quote takes us back to the decentralization issue. If co-ordination and integration only attain their full effects by directly involving the members of the community, it is difficult to see that this could be achieved at the national level of planning and policy-making.

It is frequently pointed out that in order to be successful, co-ordination and integration must imply a certain degree of 'de-professionalization', of divesting the 'professionals' (professional planners are often mentioned) of some of their power and replacing them by representatives of the community.

It is also acknowledged in places that such a 'de-professionalization' of planning and policy-making goes against the tide. The growing complexity of the issues at hand, particularly when intersectoral policies are concerned, demands more rather than less specialization. The answer is sought in two directions: in the request that training the relevant skills must be part of any co-ordination or integration project, and through the argument that at the sub-national levels less analytical skill and profession competence is required than at the national or international level.

It is clear that co-ordination and integration are terms that can be put to many uses. There is no simple, commonly-accepted definition, nor are there commonly accepted objectives. It would seem preferable to avoid using the term 'objectives' when speaking about co-ordination or integration of policies and planning. Co-ordination and integration are 'technical' instruments that can be used to attain more efficiently any policy or planning objective.

But this is too simplistic. As is the case with many 'techniques', co-ordination and integration may, many usually do, have unintended side-effects. If taken seriously, they promote co-operation between partners from different backgrounds and disciplines, representing divergent and often conflicting interests. Conflict-management, accepting

compromises and even sacrificing some of one's own interests and seeking out common ground with others, may indeed create the spirit of community that, in our view, is both a condition and an outcome of successful co-ordination and integration.

Another inference from the above is that co-ordination and integration are in general demand not only because of the growing complexity of the problems that planning and policy-making must tackle, but also because they are symptoms of a widespread dissatisfaction with current central administration and bureaucracy. Dissatisfaction with bureacracy can indeed be called without undue exaggeration *le mal du siècle*. The piecemeal approach proper to national and sub-national administrations provokes frustration and dissatisfaction at all levels of society. The resulting demand for overall approaches and for overall solutions is indeed one of the common justifications of co-ordination and integration.

Policy co-ordination and plan integration in the first instance leave the existing bureaucratic machinery intact. But if the rules of the game are respected, they are likely to lead to a questioning of its underlying premises, and this is precisely why representatives of sectoral planning and policy making are likely to develop defense mechanisms.

One of two basic conditions must be met in order to prevent these defense mechanisms from vitiating the co-ordination process: a minimum of concensus as to the common policy objectives, attained either before work on policy co-ordination commences or as a result of dialogue and common action; or authority, that is to say, the use of power of a higher order in order to set the rules of the game, the essence of the procedures and the general direction of the expected outcomes.

Often some amount of authoritative direction may be needed in order to get the process started. This is one of the reasons why the co-ordination of policies and the integration of planning are often entrusted to Prime Minister's offices or placed under their direct authority. In the longer run, however, consensus alone seems able to guarantee the survival and the success of co-ordination and of integration.

2. Defining concepts and outlining the theoretical framework

CONCEPTS

Defining concepts precisely is the crux of any international activity. It may become a nightmare if such abstract notions as 'co-ordination' and 'integration' are used.

A frequent attitude is to agree on a working definition and to postpone a more thorough epistemological debate *ad infinitum*. This does not solve the problem as in the course of the discussions definitional issues are frequently raised.

No attempt will in the following be made to clarify definitively the meaning of the terms used. We will simple recall the essential of the relevant texts.

Co-ordination is most often used to design action for relating policy in a particular field to developments in other sectors. In this connotation, co-ordination is virtually synonymous to adaptation of the relevant policy to evolutions elsewhere.

Integration indicates a blending of policies or planning for several fields into a unified process. In the relevant background reports, 'integration' is almost exclusively used for planning and 'co-ordination' for policy-making.

Simple definitions such as these do not reflect the variety of uses and interpretations in countries and on the international scene. What exactly is meant by co-ordination or integration is to a large extent determined by the specific parameters of each particular political context. Thus, in planned national economies, planning is the structural dimension which integrates planning, policy and administration and is thus used as an integrating mechanism that facilitates policy co-ordination. In most developed Western and in many developing cousntries, planning has always been conceived from a disciplinary perspective. It can therefore not play an integrating role unless it is made interdisciplinary; it can eventually provide a common theoretical foundation for the various planning sectors that are involved. But there is a more fundamental difference between the two types of political systems. In countries with a planned economy, planning and policy-making refer to comprehensive development plans that in turn result from a scientific and rational analysis of the problems confronting society. The integrating rationale is thus provided from the onset and it guides all subsequent steps. In the latter group, integration can only be strived at as a secondary goal as there is no such comprehensive rationale available. Its legitimacy is likely to derive from practical considerations and in particular from the experienced inefficiency and irrelevance of sectoral planning and policy-making.

The contrast between both types of political contexts has recently lost some of its sharpness. In the planned economies, the scientific-rational paradigm has often been blended with a more pragmatic approach. Planning has lost some of its earlier integrating power. In the second group, the need for intersectoral planning and policy-making and hence for interdisciplinary approaches has laid the foundations for a more comprehensive social paradigm and contributed to more comprehensive planning and policy approaches.

The ultimate goals for policy co-ordination are

in some reports set very high. They seem to relate to an implicit global comprehensive societal concept and/or development plan. Thus Kutsch states that 'co-ordination in its most proper sense presupposed a clear view of the joint goal towards whose achievement (the concerned fields of policy-making) are to strive' (Technical Consultation . . ., 1986*d*, p. 6.), but he immediately adds 'that true co-ordination defies the present state of our capabilities' and that 'the foremost practical challenge . . . is to reduce frictions in their (the policies) interplay to a minimum' and 'thus, for the time being, we must seek co-ordination in whatever approximation our means allow us to'.

Co-ordination in this 'minimum' interpretation consists in the adaptation of one field to another, i.e. the most common connotation of the term. Thus the adaptation of the curriculum to requirements arising from the development of science figures under 'co-ordination'. The term refers in this case to the instruments and the institutional arrangements created to plan and implement the curriculum reform.

The minimum interpretation implies in principle that each sector of policy-making remains autonomous, the master of its own decisions, even if this autonomy is a function by the exchange of inputs and outputs with other sectors. But outside pressure can considerably restrict this autonomy. If the pressure is considerable, the policy-making field in question may lose part of its identity and lose control over part of the system. The 'minimum' co-ordination has thus become a 'maximum', at least if one can still speak of 'co-ordination' instead of 'subordination'. The individual goal pattern gives way to a common goal pattern. But such a common pattern can probably not come into existence without major changes in the political context. Outside power and pressure are but one of the ways in which such patterns can emerge. They can also result from a process of growing towards a consensus, of accepting he pre-eminence of common and superior interests. This requires, however, a degree of self-denial and of openness that is not always present in large institutions.

The more likely alternative is therefore that the 'stronger' field uses its power of persuasion and perhaps its power per se to impose its will on the weaker.

Common goal structures may, however, also come into being in specific political circumstances. This may be the case in newly independent nations where power and interests have not yet been consolidated in strong sectoral administrations. Most references to co-ordination of sectoral policies in the framework of overall integrated development concern developing countries.

The possibilities for policy co-ordination in the 'real' or 'maximum' sense thus seem to depend on the existence of a development paradigm that is binding on all concerned.

Integration could be seen as the logical outcome of successful co-ordination. It refers to planning or policy-making for several fields being handled in an integrated way, that is, disciplines and sectors merged into one institutional set-up in charge of producing a comprehensive plan or policy.

In the usual connotation, the accent lies on the organizational arrangements leading to the envisaged goal. But as is the case with co-ordination, the word 'integration' is often used to '*advocate* or *pronounce upon* a state of affairs' (Carr-Hill, 1986, p. 67), as a claim rather than as a description. Means and ends are thus confounded. Programmes are called 'integrated' if they have attained their objectives, whereas the failure of programmes is attributed to a supposed 'lack of integration'.

This ignores the fact that the reasons for success or failure differ from case to case and range from precise incidental factors in the implementation period to changes in the overall socio-political context. 'Integration' defined in this manner is too flexible and, for policy and planning purposes, an unusable concept.

A more rewarding approach consists in concentrating on the instruments and methods that characterize 'integrated' (or for that matter 'co-ordinated') planning or policy-making. Unfortunately, this does not lead to much more clarity. In the relevant literature 'There is no obvious "technique" which can be recommended to provide a more rapid assessment of (mis-)fits . . . The point is that effective planning is as much an art as a science' (Carr-Hill, 1986, 68).

There is, however, perhaps another solution to this dilemma. Abstract concepts such as these apparently only acquire a more precise meaning in a particular context. Integration and co-ordination have as many meanings and connotations, they require as many methods and techniques, as there are levels and types of planning and policy-making. Only well-planned evaluative case studies allow identification of the specific factors and combinations of factors resulting in the success of the failure of co-ordination and integration.

Another often-used term is *harmonization* or 'the harmonization function'. This is a more general expression, connotating consensus as a result of a policy dialogue as to goals and instruments (Reiff and Khan, 1986, p.7). It is also often used to designate a state of affairs.

It has been suggested that it should not be concluded that the terms 'co-ordination', 'integration' and the like should be banned from the planners' and policy-makers' vocabulary. But there is certainly a pressing need to clarify the specific conditions, methods and factors involved in each particular case if confusion is to be avoided.

Whether the accent lies on harmonization, on co-ordination or on integration depends to a large extent on the stage reached or intended in the planning or policy-making process under consideration. Thus, for example, in countries where an early beginning is made with planning and policy-making as an organized and institutionalized process, it seems likely that a certain amount of

harmonization between sectors and projects would be envisaged. In fact, newly independent countries, corresponding to this description, often aim at the 'maximum' solution, integration.

Some attention must also be paid to shifts in the meaning of key concepts in the social reality outside the strict planning and policy process sphere. Thus it is that the meaning of 'work' and correspondingly that of 'non-work' and of 'leisure' has evolved considerably in the recent past owing in particular to the growing importance of voluntary and unpaid work in modern societies. Similarly, the expressions 'active' and 'non-active' population have undergone significant changes.

A similar evolution characterizes 'education' and 'training' as distinct from 'work', due to the increase of mixed work-training schemes and to the increased role of education-training in the work-place and/or directly related to work. The rapidly growing place of part-time work is another factor that contributes to conceptual shifts meriting close attention.

One effect that the above changes on the work-training-education scene have in common is that they obscure the borderlines between domains that hitherto seemed to be clearly delineated. It is no coincidence that the need for intersectoral policies and hence for co-ordination is greatest in these sectors and that most examples of success and failure, as well as of conflict or 'harmony', relate to the interrelation between education and work.

THEORIES

The quality and relevance of policy-making depend to a considerable extent on the development of appropriate theories and models. The need for theory, and indeed for a philosophical and ethical foundation for policy-making, has grown exponentially with the increasing encroachment of policy upon society and upon the individual.

In the wake of scientific positivism and empiricism, rationalistic theories and models of planning and policy-making have been developed and generally adhered to. Already in the 1960's, however, the rationalistic theories came under heavy attack. Policy-making has been described as the 'science' of 'muddling through'. More constructive interpretations talked about an 'incremental model' of policy-making and others have proposed a 'mixed scanning theory'. Lindblom's 'partisan mutual adjustment' theory has achieved much adhesion.

A common characteristic of these critical analyses is recognition of the role of non-cognitive and hence non-rationalizable factors in decision-making and, eventually, of the importance of the 'human factor' and of human actors and of their organizations, with all that this implies in terms of individual and group interests, of prejudices, sympathies and antipathies, of lobbying and perhaps corruption, but also of motivation and willingness to co-operate, to compromise and to make sacrifices. The 'human factor' is a Pandora's box whose varied and changeable content defies rational analysis.

Among policy-makers and planners as well as scientific observers of policy and planning, this has created much uncertainty as to the precise nature of these processes and raises serious doubts as to the feasibility of any 'scientific' approach and analysis, and hence as to the 'manageability' of policy-making and planning as such. This uncertainty coincides, paradoxically, with a growing appeal to planning and policy-making for controlling and steering the evolution of society through rational decision-making. While there may be a widespread demand for 'less bureacracy', but there is undoubtedly at the same time a demand for 'more policy' (not to be confounded with 'more centralism').

It can be argued that the 'human factors' have their own rationale, that they obey sociological laws that can be formulated. Policy-making and policy-analysis are in need of paradigms that incorporate these factors.

Co-ordination and integration are not restricted to tuning one sectoral policy to another. If they are not to remain mere accommodations of inadequate policies, they must accommodate these 'irrational' factors that have been considered too long as deranging elements.

The awareness of the need for such a new theoretical basis has grown, in particular in the developed countries. It is on the whole much less present in the developing countries where the 'rationalism' retains a strong position, often against all reason. This may, among other reasons, be due to the fact that planning and policy-making in many developing countries have little grip on reality. The demand for policy co-ordination is to a considerable extent inspired by the desire to increase this grip. It stems in particular from political leaders and from national administrations and not, as is often the case in developed countries, from the 'users'.

The demand for *interdisciplinarity* in the scientific approach to planning and policy-making must be seen in this context. Interdisciplinarity denotes an organizational principle for multi-level co-ordination of terms, concepts and disciplines, producing a higher-level concept rooted in norms and values. It has thus both a normative connotation and a scientific grounding.

In the literature these are seen as complementary. Interdisciplinarity is considered an appropriate instrument for analysing, understanding and eventually mastering the 'whole' social system and hence an indispensable tool for co-ordinated or integrated policy and planning. As a theoretical construct, it has strong appeal. It allows the linking of theory and action, science and policy-making, in one single coherent framework. The conflicts and incompatibilities between sectoral policies can thus in principle be transcended and reorganized according to a higher principle.

For the time being, however, interdisciplinary

analysis has little bearing on scientific reality. Admittedly, in many developing countries a higher-ranking political, and therefore normative, principle has been offered under the name of 'overall integrated development', but in very few countries has it provided the basis for overall integrated policy; and it has on the whole lacked a serious scientific grounding.

The theoretical foundation for society's development and modernization has for over a century been rationalistic economic theory, built on the assumption of continuous economic growth and on an ever-increasing demand for higher-level skills. It is now widely thought that the times of high economic growth are over, but there is less agreement as to what will replace the growth paradigm. Stagnation and decline in some sectors of economic activity go hand in hand with impetuous growth in others. At the same time, a shift in priorities can be noticed to the detriment of social and emancipatory causes, and sometimes to the detriment of cultural interests and drives not clearly related to national identity or prestige.

The breakdown of the economic growth paradigm has not, however, been accompanied by a decreased importance of the economic dimension in overall policy-making. On the contrary, the margin for non-economic causes has narrowed, while selective growth in a liberal perspective and for the benefit of the economically strong has replaced comprehensive economic policies.

Parallel to this, a significant change can be noticed for what concerns the phase in the overall process of policy-making at which co-ordination is used for the benefit of broader social objectives. On the one hand, co-ordination is gradually shifted to the implementation phases in policy-making, away from decision-making. The traditional belief that plans and policies are capable of providing 'integration at the point of delivery' has given way to the conviction that it is at the 'point of consumption' that integration is more effective. At this stage, however, it is no longer national or sub-national planning and policy-making, but the market forces that are called upon. The 'delivery' strategies, tending to be top-down and generally the privileged field of action of the public sector and of public policy, have not proved their worth. Hence the appeal of the 'consumption' strategy and the concomitant withdrawal of public policy intervention and delegation of tasks to the private sector.

The crucial dilemma remains, however, how to increase the efficiency of policy without sacrificing what were hitherto considered essential values. In the developed countries there are strong pressures for making such sacrifices and offering compensation via ad hoc policy constructions to penalized social groups.

Decentralization of political power must be seen against this background. It offers the possibility of locating integration at the delivery point, close to consumer and user. It may thus offer a real alternative to the market-force strategy.

There can, however, be no decentralization without a careful re-distribution of responsibilities among decision-making bodies at national, regional and local levels, or without vertical co-ordination of policies among these three levels. The experience of countries with a federal structure may be of great value in this respect.

The existence of a growing private sector may, however, strongly complicate matters. 'Private sector' is a term that refers to a multitude of institutions and persons whose activities and strategies are equally varied, whereas their role and influence is often not well-known to public policy-makers, information frequently being difficult to obtain or misleading. On the other hand, the influence of the private sector is undoubtedly growing. In education, for example, private publishers have always had a strong influence on curriculum development and examinations in many countries. But their power has grown exponentially, parallel to the rapid development of new technologies, of communications, of marketing methods, and so on. National policy-makers are faced not with national private forces, but with internationally-directed strategies over which they have virtually no control.

For decentralized policy-making, this represents a very difficult challenge. They rarely have at their disposal the competence and the experience to negotiate with powerful private partners whose action radius stretches far beyond the region. Part of the answer lies in building expertise. Useful lessons can be drawn from planning for adult and non-formal education and from community development projects.

A final factor that intervenes strongly is that of the quality of the information available. Here again sub-national decision-makers are at a disadvantage vis-à-vis powerful private interests, not to speak of the 'users' whose participation in decision-making is virtually pointless if they are not on a par with the other participants as concerns data supply and analysis.

The possibility of developing a generally valid theory of policy-making and sound theoretical thinking about co-ordination and integration of planning and policy-making seems as remote as ever. Efforts should, as already indicated, centre on observing and describing different types of co-ordination and integration and confronting them with the prevailing contextual variables.

This would allow the study of the interaction between the various components of policy-making and planning in different cultural-historical and socio-political settings, for example the interaction between public and private components of policy in a given sector, or between centralized and decentralized policy-making. Testable hypotheses could then be formulated as to the combination(s) of factors seeming to affect the outcomes of the process. The accent should lie on looking for significant differences rather than common features, the usual procedure in international comparison.

Mastery of the required methodological tools for such an approach is unfortunately rarely available. Even in the scientific world, ideas such as the above about methods of (international) comparison have only recently begun to be accepted and are not generally shared. Nevertheless, they may show the way out of the deadlock in which the scientific analysis of policies and of policy co-ordination in an international perspective finds itself.

3. Methods, models and techniques

Methods, models and techniques are the planner's implements for reducing policies' intrinsic whimsicality. To be useful, they must meet almost impossible conditions. The difficulties are even greater when it comes to analysing, co-ordinating and integrating planning and policy approaches from different domains, each having its own scientific, technical and political traditions.

The first answer consists in developing a common language, a common frame of thought enabling planners and policy-makers from different sectors to work together. It is here that interdisciplinarity comes in as the magical solution. 'The basic problem therefore [i.e. the challenge of conceptually integrating the components from different social domains within a common framework] is to combine a variety of disciplinary perspectives into a coherent framework'. (Carr-Hill, 1986, p. 13).

It is, however, common knowledge that little progress has been made in developing interdisciplinary thinking, except in new fields such as systems analysis. Hence the interest that planners and policy-makers have since long shown for systems analysis. But there are also drawbacks to the reliance on systems analysis and related approaches. Somewhat provocatively, one could say that there are as many versions and interpretations as there are schools and experts. Systems analysis deals well with bare organizational structures and quantifiable facts, but has great difficulty with less palpable and quantifiable factors.

Nevertheless, systems analysis has contributed greatly to conceptually and methodologically clarifying the processes of planning and policy-making, and of co-ordination and integration of policy and planning.

A second imperative is a common data base, 'common' that is, to the sectors and fields in question. Every policy sector develops the data base it needs for its own purposes. The development of a common base, and even the motivation to create it, depends on the existence of a minimum consensus at the policy-making and implementation level. Most attempts to develop integrated data systems have failed for lack of this, or for lack of sufficient political support. But probably the stakes were set too high. Fully integrated data systems are perhaps statisticians' dreams, but are in fact beyond reach. A more modest approach consists in deciding collectively (that is, between the planners and policy-makers directly involved) what kind of data are needed for each successive step and attempting to generate these data insofar as they are not routinely available. This requires agreement as to what is to be observed, registered and analysed, which brings us back to the required minimum consensus and political support.

From the above it is understandable that in the background reports top priority is given to 'learning' and 'training' as a third condition for successful co-ordination or integration. Representatives of different planning and policy-making sectors have different backgrounds and have in the course of their careers become specialized in a 'language' and in approaches and methods, if not in a 'style' adapted to their needs, tending to ignore or simply eliminate signals from other sectors. Creating a common language therefore implies training and educating the actors.

A viewpoint that carries the argument a step further is that the essence of co-ordination and integration consists of this learning process. Formulated thus, the argument runs the risk of backfiring. Policy-makers and funding agencies will not appreciate excessive stress on the need for training planners and project managers. The view that the aims of co-ordination and integration have in fact been attained once the learning process is completed and a common language found can be defended. It satisfies the argument that the ultimate stage of co-ordination and integration is attainment of full consensus as to the goals.

The preceding conditions are, however, rarely met in co-ordination or integration projects. The best, and perhaps only possible approach therefore is to create a minimum of starting conditions adapted to each case and proceed step by step, without a preconceived plan. The term 'self-management adjustments' *v.* planned and (over)organized co-ordination has been used in this context, although the author feels that such attempts should be regarded as 'proto-manifestations of co-ordinative activities' and 'can be recognized only with difficulty as "co-ordination".' Indeed, in order to deserve the term 'co-ordination', at least some of the above mentioned conditions must be met; how precise, how elaborate and of what kind these preliminarily required arrangements and agreements should be depend on the type and level of co-ordination being pursued.

Thus, for example, co-ordination or integration between planning and policy for different sectors (education, economy, culture) probably requires much more precise administrative and institutional pre-conditions than co-ordination between planning and policy for the same sector but at different

levels (national, regional, local). Furthermore, the integration of or co-ordination with 'extraneous' factors raises intricate scientific and methodological problems, in particular vis-à-vis a common data base, as well as complex problems of communication and participants' status. It has been suggested that as concerns this type of co-ordination/integration, insufficient use has been made of the possibilities offered by the new technologies.

Another factor that must be taken into account is the precise state in the planning or policy-making process at which a co-ordinatory linkage is attempted. This may range from the construction of a common data base to real-life, grassroots implementation. It may concern mainly the creation of common training or research schemes. The available reports contain a host of suggestions as to the types of co-ordination and integration that can be envisaged and for each of them the appropriate techniques and instruments. They also show a basic ambiguity as to the general approach. On the one hand, great clarity is demanded as to objectives and instruments; time-schedules should be set and financial and personnel resources defined; provisions for staff training should be included. On the other hand, the uniqueness of each particular case is stressed and hence the need for a case-to-case approach, for a minimum of compulsory initial conditions and a maximum of organizational flexibility. It is also recognized that overly precise conditions and assumptions as to technical competence, training and data base may be incompatible with broad and often voluntary participation and that they may confine co-ordination and integration work to a small circle of professionals at the national level.

From the above it can be concluded that feasible and hopefully viable scenarios should be developed covering as many of the likely cases as possible rather than universal models or techniques. More knowledge about the organization, functioning and effectiveness of past and current co-ordination and integration projects and programmes must be available if this is to be implemented. Here, the exchange of South-South experience appears at least as useful as the common North-South exchange.

Another factor that should be taken into account is the evolution of planning and policy-making in the present socio-economic and political climate. Long-term policy-making tends to give way to short-term, comprehensive and integrated/co-ordinated policy for piecemeal 'instant problem solving'. Planners tend, because of their traditions, to follow this trend reluctantly.

On the other hand, short-term piecemeal approaches require ad hoc arrangements adapted to each case and each task which has implications for the professional competence that can be mobilized.

A pessimistic conclusion would be that as a result of growing dissension in societies as to basic long-term policy objectives, of the breakdown of traditional policy-making and of the lower level of competence that can be mobilized for co-ordination and intergration's sake, the overall level of planning and policy-making, and of co-ordination and integration of planning and policy is bound to suffer. But there is a more optimistic interpretation. The above kind of co-ordination and integration proceeds from the directly perceived needs of the institutions and persons at the level of implementation. Motivation compensates for a hypothetical loss of competence. Moreover, due to better education and training, more competence is now available than in the past. Plan integration and policy co-ordination have become daily practice, resulting in more failure, but also more success. And, at any rate, the process is irreversible: in the present state of planning and policy-making, co-ordination and integration are conditions for survival. The task at hand is to monitor this variety of trial-and-error experiences and to make countries, institutions and persons profit from each other's experience.

STRUCTURES FOR CO-ORDINATION

Some mention has already been made of organizational arrangements for co-ordination and integration. Theory and methods on the one hand, and organizational matters on the other, are closely related. Examples of administrative arrangements for planning and policy co-ordination and integration are, however, much easier to find than are consistent theories. One sometimes has the impression that administrations tend to create new administrative structures whenever a new problem arises and to consider the problem solved once this incantatory ritual has been performed.

Even ad hoc co-ordinative efforts require administrative structures in line with their specific objectives as well as with the socio-political context. Responsibilities need to be attributed, procedures for discussion and reporting settled, and budgetary and other resources and the rules that guide their use specified. The precise arrangements made and agreements reached depend, inter alia, on the organization of the national, regional and local administrations and the division of tasks among them. At the national level, much depends on the policy mandates of the relevant ministries, which can vary from very fragmented to highly centralized in 'top ministries'. Several trends can be observed.

New fields of policy-making are often initially attached to existing administrations. If they gain sufficient weight, they may become independent and dispose of their own budget and administration. Examples are cultural policy and, more recently, environment, communication, external trade, cultural minorities and the condition of women.

Economy, often combined with finance and budgeting, tends to become a super-ministry that elaborates the main, economic development trends within which other policy-making sectors must operate. The process of establishing these

comprehensive policy trends is often euphemistically called 'co-ordination'; it usually has all the characteristics of subordination.

In terms of vertical distribution of political responsibilities, three-tiered structures are most common; in many countries, a fourth administrative layer traditionally exists between the regional and the local/communial level. In countries with no traditional fourth tier, attempts to create one, either between national and regional administrations ('super-regions') or between regional and local, have met with varying success.

In developed countries, increasing numbers of services and institutions in charge of generating pre-policy information, analysis and research and/or implementation-stage products such as curricula, informational software, communication structures and the like are being created. Their status ranges from full integration in the relevant central administration to full autonomy, in the latter case often under the direct aegis of the Prime Minister's office. Increasing financial dependence upon government financing tends to progressively restrict autonomy and make close co-ordination with central administrations more imperative. Greater dependence on public means is blurring the dividing line between public and private institutions of this kind.

The situation in most developing countries differs strongly from that in the developed countries. Variations also exist within each of these groups. Typologies are therefore difficult to extablish. Some trends, however, can be observed.

Education, culture and science in the developing countries often remain under the authority of one Ministry. There is nevertheless an increasing trend to split them up among separate administrations. New fields such as communication and environment are rarely administration units in their own right, falling within the Ministry of Education. Policy co-ordination is thus very much an 'in-house' affair.

The pre-eminence of the economics and finance Ministries is in most developed countries as pronounced as in the developing countries, but their autonomy is considerably reduced by dependence on external financing and technical assistance which often work directly with relevant Ministries, if not directly with concerned departments and sub-departments, project and programme officers, and sub-national authorities, all of which complicates co-ordination.

In most developing countries, regional and local administrations have little power, save where tradition, history and religion assign them a strong role. The 'modern' sectors of policy-making, such as education, science, technology and communication, are usually highly centralized. As a result, there is no problem of vertical co-ordination and integration. In fact, however, central administrations in developing countries often have little control over policy implementation at regional and local levels. Co-ordination with these levels is hampered by the virtual absence of administrative and scientific-technical counterparts.

Information, research and software production in the developing countries tend, when they actually exist, to be directly controlled by and attached to the relevant central administrations. Co-ordination is thus in-house, but the growing number of services and institutions presents many developing countries with a complex task for which they are not prepared.

The situation is further complicated by the important role played by private foreign companies and by recent private national institutions and initiatives.

In several countries private schools have had a come-back, often in anticipation of expected benefits as a result of competition with the public sector. Their comeback also marks the failure of public education to respond to new kinds of demand. Private schools and institutions thus become privileged partners in the co-ordination of education with communication, technology and the like, sectors from which public education is virtually excluded.

Software production and modern communication structures are often controlled by international corporations; national administrations, often having no experienced planning and policy-making machinery in these domains, are unable to play a significant role in their development.

The pivotal role of education in economic and in overall development is acknowledged. This lends education policy a strength it no longer has in many developed countries; most five-year development plans explicitly give it a key role, and as a result, education is given a leading place in the co-ordination of sectoral policies.

The status of co-ordinating and integrating mechanisms corresponds to the status and the degree of sophistication acquired by policy-making and planning in the countries concerned. Thus in some countries, such as Benin and Burundi, a few co-ordination mechanisms exist, but effective cross-sectoral co-ordination relies heavily on the voluntary disposition of various partners. Somewhat haphazard and incidental, 'proto-manifestations of co-ordinative activites' might be an appropriate description.

The request for policy co-ordination is often voiced by international funding agencies, but more and more in developing countries a genuine need for co-ordination is felt and, as a result, request for assistance in training national administrators and research workers in the required skills are submitted to international organizations.

Information on the present state of co-ordination in developing countries is rare. Nevertheless it may be useful to present the available data, in particular those contained in the country reports presented at the 1986 and 1987 Unesco meetings and in the regional syntheses prepared at Unesco's request.

Africa

In many African countries, the issue of policy co-ordination has only just started appearing on political agendas. In most countries, lack of experience and lack of technical and analytical competence make it difficult to adequately respond to this new demand.

More than elsewhere, the notion of 'overall' or 'integrated' development occupies a central place in policy-making, with 'a multi-dimensional dynamic process, and embracing material, political, social, moral, cultural, spiritual, economic and other components' with the intrinsic potential to create the conditions 'in which all the various elements become integrated and harmonized' (Joof, 1986, p. 3). But this happy state has yet to be attained anywhere.

Education occupies a central place in all overall development concepts. It enables individuals and communities to understand and master their environment, to ensure their self-preservation and to work for the improvement of society as a whole. It has the two-fold task of preserving social values, culture and mores, and of responding to the imperatives of social change and transformation. There is, at least in theory, no conflict between the individual and society, between preservation of the past and preparation for the future, between modernization and preservation.

Self-reliance is the target towards which all policy efforts should be directed.

At the same time, it is recognized that these statements are more reflections of what African countries wish to achieve than of reality itself. The gap between the present and the desired future is perhaps nowhere as great as in Africa. But bold policy statements such as the above, however remote they be from reality, may in themselves become powerful motivating forces, helping to bring about the future.

Unlike other policy sectors, education policies have a rather long past and are firmly established in the overall administrative system; this legitimizes their key role in the development process and reinforces socio-economic development role, making them a powerful tool for both social control and social change.

At the same time, however, it is recognized that the present African education systems have low relevance to the realities, needs and aspirations of the population, or to the needs of the economy's modern sectors. Education thus misses both boats: it does not serve the genuine needs of the population and it does not serve those of the modern economy.

Co-ordination of education with policies in other sectors, and in particular with those just mentioned, becomes a formidable task. It must meet objectives that are difficult to reconcile and compromises and sacrifices will be necessary.

Lack of information limits what can be said about the present arrangements for policy co-ordination. The initial stage of such efforts in Benin and Burundi has been mentioned. A similar statement applies to the United Republic of Tanzania: there is no evidence of a coherent set-up for policy co-ordination, although the foundations for Tanzanian education and overall development policies generate an urgent need for co-ordinated and even integrated policy-making.

Kenya has a relatively well-structured set-up, anchored in the co-ordination of education with scientific/technological development. Mandatory institutional arrangments exist for co-ordination between Ministries and with research and development institutions. While the fact that the minister in charge of education is the Minister of Education, Science and Technology facilitates co-ordination considerably, the education and training tasks of other Ministries are also part of the co-ordination arrangement. Special committees of representatives of these Ministries, of the Ministry of Education, Science and Technology and of the relevant training institutions are in charge. (Joof, 1986, pp. 16-17).

The absence of clearly-defined sectoral policies in many African countries is a major obstacle to policy co-ordination. Sectoral Ministries, sometimes occupying a weak position in the overall policy-making machinery, see co-ordination with other policies as a threat to their own positions.

Finally, the simple existence of co-ordination arrangements does not imply that co-ordination is achieved or even genuinely attempted. Co-ordination at the decision-making level is often not followed up at the policy implementation level. The lack of references to 'vertical' co-ordination between national and sub-national levels is in this respect revealing.

Arab States

The differences in economic level among the Arab States have recently increased rapidly. For the oil-exporting states, the rapid increase in wealth has proved a mixed blessing. Dependence on imported goods has increased considerably, together with increasing reliance on foreign labour and with the neglect of agriculture.

The crucial role of science, technology and modern communications for further development is generally recognized. But at the same time, many Arab States are concerned with keeping economic and technological development in harmony with national and Arab tradition and culture. Cultural policy therefore plays an important role in overall development. The confrontation between progress and tradition is not always easy, as can be seen in apparently conflicting statements and policies about the role of women in public life and the role of the Islamic religion. A similar ambiguity marks the attitude towards imported cultural and technological products considered indispensable but at the same time suspect for their negative influence on national and Arab values and traditions.

The picture is, however, not homogeneous. Important differences of appreciation as well as of policy and practice exist between for example countries in the Maghreb such as Morocco and Tunisia and countries on the Arab peninsula such as Saudi Arabia and Yemen.

Economic and technological development have accentuated existing cultural prejudices such as the high esteem for the traditional humanistic professions and the low repute of manual work. The latter's low status spills over to the new technical jobs and to education for scientific and technical professions. This may also explain why the creation of high level scientific and technical institutions in several countries has not been followed up by appropriate implementation and development action. Efforts have been undertaken recently to reduce this 'implementation gap' (Kotite, 1986, p. 8).

On the positive side, the social characteristics and attitudes, required for scientific and technical research and development 'are part of the legacy of the Arab philosophers, scientists, mathematicians and men of arts throughout history' (Kotite, 1986, p. 9).

The lopsided and often uncontrolled development of many countries in the region, which has taken the form of strong growth of construction, transport, communications and services coupled with low investment in high level manufacturing and transformation industries, has resulted in massive exodus of highly qualified personnel and massive import of low skilled labour. The picture is complicated by a growing intraregional dependence between some of the oil-poor and of the oil-rich countries. This double-edged brain-drain can only be stopped by a well-conceived human resource policy, but this is precisely what is missing in most Arab States. The general weakness of manpower planning and the poor links between economic and education policies are weak spots in many overall development policies in the region.

Although evidence provided in the available documentation is incomplete, it seems fair to say that, given the difficulties of the task at hand, in most Arab States not enough is done to co-ordinate sectoral policies. But there are many efforts and there are exceptions.

The co-ordination of education with science and technology is often emphatically related to the cultural dimension: the promotion of science and technology through education must respect and further cultural values and traditions. There is great concern to maintain an equilibrium between development on the basis of science and technology and social and cultural development.

The co-ordination between education and science/technology is in most cases entrusted to newly-created academies of science, institutions or councils operating in close co-operation with Ministries of Education, Social Affairs and Labour, and Agriculture. It is the Ministry of Education's task to see to it that science and technology are developed in a manner which is not detrimental to cultural values, a co-ordinative task facilitated by this Ministry's responsibility for cultural and science policy in many countries. Non-formal education and the mass media play an important role. Science and youth clubs are specifically geared to the scientific aim, whereas cultural centres and cultural manifestations of all kinds are responsible for the co-ordination between education and culture.

In most countries the Ministry of Education also co-ordinates those institutions that do not directly depend on a Ministry, such as academies of science.

Thus in Saudi Arabia, overall human resource development is the responsibility of the Ministry of Education, while technical and vocational education are organized by the General Organization for Technical Education and Vocational Training under the authority of both the Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Social Affairs and Labour.

In Kuwait the Public Authority for Applied Education, an independent body, is responsible for technical education and training centres. In Morocco, the Permanent Commission for Training and Employment supervises vocational and technical training, whereas science policy is the responsibility of the National Centre for Co-ordination and Planning of Scientific and Technological Research.

In many Arab States the response to the need for intersectoral policy-making has been to create special institutions outside the existing administrative framework; academies, commissions, centres and the like. Staffed with experts from different backgrounds and with representatives from different policy sectors, fair guarantees are provided for their working as interdisciplinary and intersectoral institutions.

Administratively, the link between sectoral policies and with overall national development policy is also ensured. The Ministry of Education plays often the role of *maître d'oeuvre* of these constructions. Its key role is further enhanced by its representation in other Ministries where cultural, scientific or technological matters are decided.

However, in many countries the process of a progressive division of political and administrative responsibilities has only just begun. The need for co-ordination is beginning to be felt, but measures for policy co-ordination have not yet been taken. It may, however, be that there is in this respect more than meets the eye. Additional detailed information on countries such as Egypt, with its long administrative experience, and Algeria with its sophisticated central policy-making machinery, would probably shed more light on the realities of policy co-ordination in the Arab States.

Asia

The Asian countries offer a wide spectrum of levels of economic development, geographical size and population size. Some have known a long colonial past and their political system retains remnants of

this; others have never been colonized. Independence from colonial rule dates back several decades in some, a few years in others; some have recently known devastating wars for independence, others have undergone dramatic political changes. Political systems vary from strong centralization to shared political responsibilities between State and regions.

Differences in cultural and religious traditions are as important, if not more so. Culture and religion are closely related in most Asian countries but in very different fashions. In a few, there is a State religion; in most, religion is a private affair, but this is not to mean that religious issues do not profoundly affect, and sometimes divide, social and political life.

Similar observations could be made concerning the roles of science, technology and communication. Their vital interest for development is unanimously recognized, but their state of development varies from highly sophisticated to first-stage research and equipment.

In the view of most Asian countries, material and ethical/cultural well-being and progress should go hand-in-hand. In official texts, great pain is taken to stress the precedence of ethical and cultural values above material well-being. The accent in this respect is more often put on education than on science and technology. Little mention is made of the fear, expressed by many Arab States, that science and technology will lead to alienation from inherited cultural and ethical values. One reason for this may be that, unlike most Arab and African countries, many Asian countries have achieved full control over their scientific and technological development, some exporting technology.

The policies we are concerned with here are, in most countries, centrally formulated and laid down in elaborate guidelines. Education policies have here, as in most developing countries, a longer tradition than science, technology and communication and hence are more firmly established.

Human resource development is a rather recent concept, grouping a number of development functions formerly treated separately. The tendency is to entrust human resources policy to the office of the Prime Minister. Real human resource policies have been determined in but a few countries, and enacted in even fewer. Co-ordination of sectoral policies is seen everywhere as desirable. But in only a few countries, such as Pakistan and Thailand, has this resulted in the creation of a system of co-ordinating mechanisms under the aegis of the Prime Minister's office. In others, such as Bangladesh and Japan, obstacles of practice and principle stand in the way of central policy co-ordination. In Japan it is in particular the powerful Ministry of Education that successfully resists attempts to introduce central policy co-ordination, notably with manpower and economic policies.

Central and institutionalized co-ordination is, however, only one way in which effective policy co-ordination can be achieved, and the examples of several Asian countries show that it is not necessarily the most efficient. Two other solutions have been chosen.

The first of these is spontaneous ad hoc co-ordination at the level of policy implementation. In Japan, the universities effectively play a key role in adapting education to economic demand, acting as job placement offices and accepting only as many students as they are likely to place on 'their' job market. Their role is facilitated by the considerable flexibility characterizing the Japanese job market in terms of correspondence between education and job profile.

A similar co-ordination function, in this case between formal and non-formal education, is fulfilled by open universities and universities of the air. They can respond, quantitatively and qualitatively, to fluctuations in demand and supply, and function much more flexibly than can traditional institutions and serve therefore as co-ordinating institutions between education and the labour market.

The second solution involves policies co-ordinated at the decentralized and/or project levels. Thus in China the provincial governments and the local authorities are responsible for the whole range of education and training functions that at the national level are administered by different administrations. In Bangladesh a new planning and development process has been initiated at the local level that is able to register the full range of needs and mobilize all available resources. The necessary devolution of power to the local authorities has not yet been completed however. In Sri Lanka intersectoral planning and policy implementation have been achieved in the Integrated Rural Development Projects, whereas effective policy co-ordination at the central level, for instance between education and manpower needs, is still wanting.

A more successful blend of co-ordination at the central level and between central and sub-national (regional and local) levels seems to have been put in place in Thailand. The Thai example shows also the need for complementarity between co-ordination at the several levels of policy-making. It is usually at grassroots level that the best results are attained; at higher administrative levels sectoral traditions, workstyles and vested interests often act as obstacles. Whereas at the central level this resistance can be broken by the use of authority, this is more difficult, as the Thai example shows, at the provincial level. The intermediate (regional or provincial) level appears thus to be the great bottleneck. Neither the Prime Minister's office nor pressure from the grassroots level are capable of removing the obstacles here. At the local level the human factor has often a positive and even decisive influence.

Considerable importance is attached to the need for improved data collection and analysis as well as for better research facilities. In several countries, measures have been taken to remedy these

shortages, but sometimes real progress cannot be achieved without external assitance. A similar need exists at all levels concerning training staff for planning and policy co-ordination at the national and sub-national levels.

Cultural policy in its own right does not occupy a prominent place in most Asian country reports. More often than not, cultural policy is not administered by a separate Ministry; it often pertains to the Ministry of Education. Educational and cultural policies, according to several reports, are one and the same concern, and eventually co-ordination between them is not a major political matter.

4. Policies and programmes

EDUCATION POLICIES

Education systems and education policy in most developing countries are firmly established. Their strong position, often due to the colonial heritage, is not always to the countries' advantage as the systems are, as a result, often not open to outside influences. Innovations and new ideas penetrate with great difficulty and new demands are not easily satisfied unless they can be fitted into the existing moulds.

A second important factor that decisively affects education policy is the pressure of numbers. Growth, strong as it has been, has in most countries just been able to keep place with galloping demography. Here and there the demographic pressure is slowly subsiding, but a growing social demand for post-primary education represents in many countries a new factor of pressure, equally strong and requiring proportionately more and better resources. Many countries try to direct, or even stem, the flow of students at secondary and higher levels of schooling, partly in view of their limited resources, partly in order to adapt it to manpower demands. In both secondary and higher education, students have, with varying degrees of success, been kept away from humanisitc and literary programmes and directed towards scientific and technical studies. Secondary vocational and technical courses have in particular failed to attract sufficient numbers of students; surpluses of highly trained manpower go hand in hand with a severe shortage of middle-level trained personnel.

The potential of non-formal education and training is unanimously recognized; its growth potential remains unrealized almost everywhere. One reason for its slow take-off is educational administrations' unenthusiasm. But there are also success stories. Open universities and universities of the air in several countries have met with a high demand for places and have taken some of the pressure off the traditional universities. Community education programmes, usually organized within the framework of adult litteracy campaigns, have often been successful.

In Five-year Plans and policy statements, education is assigned a key role in the optimal development of human resources. Education policies are not always in line with this. Overall resources for education are much too low in some countries. The economic crisis has led to severe cuts in budgets. Universities still obtain in many countries a disproportionate share of the scarce resources, leaving secondary schools and in particular vocational and technical education seriously under-resourced.

On the other hand, serious efforts have been undertaken to make education systems meet contemporary requirements. Curricula have been adapted more or less successfully to the demands of a scientific/technological age: for example, science teaching and manual work have been introduced in primary schools, science and technology streams in secondary education have been reinforced and a host of new secondary and higher courses have been created. Computer education is not yet generally available, but its importance for science and technical education as well as for general education is generally recognized.

In some countries, the demand for better and new types of education has been met outside the public education system. Private schools enjoy a new prestige; their ability to respond rapidly to new demands and to offer good education are also publicly recognized now. Unhampered by heavy bureaucratic rules or by the public system's commitment to social objectives such as equality of educational opportunities, are often able to tap otherwise unavailable resources, which gives them an important lead over public education.

As a result, one begins here and there to perceive the beginnings of a two-track education system: a mass public system ensuring basic literacy and generous opportunities for education to all and an élite system, the latter in part financed and controlled by private sources and meeting the demand for advanced scientific and technological training, as well as that for high level administrators for the public sector. In many ways, this strongly resembles what is happening in many developed countries.

Many countries have endorsed the key role of human resource development in overall development. But there is little evidence that its full implications for education policy have been understood.

A somewhat pessimistic conclusion for what concerns the future of education in the developing countries is that the 'most probable scenario' as it is described for Malaysia, leading to a future system that 'would not be much worse than it is today' (Ahmad, Marimuthu and Ismail, 1987, p. 48) is rather likely to become reality.

EDUCATION POLICIES AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC POLICIES

Economic development and its ensuring need for educated manpower have steered educational planning since its inception. As long as economic growth continued unabated, manpower-based planning's weaknesses were cushioned by massive substitution between levels and types of training.

The economic crisis and resultant employment crisis have significantly altered this interaction. Demands on education have become more pressing and more specific, while at the same time willingness to invest in education without requiring visible economic returns has diminished. Overall demand for education keeps growing in the face of gloomy employment opportunities for school leavers; perhaps the grim employment perspectives motivate young people to increase their education and training capital. More so than in the past, education must prove its value for work and for the economy. But the implications for curricula are contradictory: schools are expected to impart directly usable knowledge and skills and at the same time to provide a broad knowledge base enabling students to adapt themselves flexibly to a rapidly changing demand structure. Demand for self-reliance, enabling pupils to create their own jobs and even their own enterprises goes hand in hand with a demand for adaptable and pliable work-attitudes, acceptance of leadership and hardship and willingness to accept menial work, far below education level and expectations. Over-education is the bitter experience of more and more young school-leavers in first jobs that hardly deserve the term job.

A growing dichotomy between the haves and have-nots has also made its appearance in education. There are good and not-so-good programmes and increasingly good and less good schools and universities, even in those countries where traditionally all schools were at least formally equal and all universities delivered degrees of equal value. Diversity is openly and strongly encouraged by education policies. Schools and universities have to become entrepreneurial; they must compete with each other for pupils and students, and for the better teachers. It is readily forgotten that in this game there are winners and losers, and perhaps in times of economic, employment and budgetary hardship many more losers than winners.

This critical appreciation is not to underestimate the positive aspects of the present trends. More responsibility, more accountability to pupils and parents and the community for the ways in which the money is spent, and closer relations with the world of work and with the community at large will in the long run benefit all. The problem is one of time, perspective and opportunity.

The economic plight of the developing countries is much greter. The economic crisis has reduced the chances of rapid economic development of the modern sector of the economy whereas the traditional sectors cannot be revitalized. Economic dependence upon upon the developed countries has grown. For many developing countries it has become more difficult to conduct cultural, social and education policies that are not strictly aligned on economic objectives.

Speaking under such conditions of the co-ordination of education policies with economic policies is an euphemism: economic supremacy is greater than ever and other policies are simply subordinated.

This bold statement ignores two factors. First, in many developing countries there is not *an* economic sector, but several. The traditional economy continues to function in many parts of the country and the urban semi-modern sector, sometimes called the urban informal sector, often thrives.

Similarly, there is not *an* education system; non-formal education in the larger sense of the word exists and in many countries is gaining momentum.

Furthermore, social, cultural and education policies have gained a momentum that resists sudden changes of direction. Education's institutional and political weight in particular are considerable and offer resistance to co-ordination with or subordination to economic policy.

Nevertheless, as the recent past has shown, these education systems are often 'colossi with feet of clay'. In many countries, the percentage of gross national product (GNP) spent on education has decreased. In many others, public support for education is waning and private initiative and private funds are called upon where direct economic interests are at stake.

Education and manpower planning have been affected by these developments. The theoretical commitment to education planning is on the whole intact and the concept of human resources development could give it a new impetus. For the time being, however, the stress is on planning for specific, narrowly-defined needs: scientific and technical personnel, communications specialists, and so on.

On the other hand, there is a growing discrepancy between the conviction that only a policy of raising the level of education and training of the population as a whole can help the developing countries to overcome their difficulties and a short-term policy of reducing educational budgets and seeking immediate and visible economic returns.

In most developing countries the conditions for the co-ordination of education with other policies are in principle favourable, in particular to co-ordination with economic policy-making. Both are conceived and directed at the central level, within the perspective of overall development. But economic changes call for new co-ordination formulae. In a first instance, co-ordination has become more complicated: more partners are involved, including private partners on both the economic and the education side whose policy perspectives are very different from those of the

public sectors. Creating a common language in these conditions is a major challenge.

The available background material provides many examples of co-ordination between economy and education, but few or none of adjustments to the new reality. There have certainly been such adjustments, but they have probably been of the self-managing type rather than planned and organized. Self-managing adjustments and changes are probably less likely to 'happen' in developing countries than in developed countries, where numerous structures and opportunities for discussion and consultation between policy-making sectors and the public and private domains exist.

In the Arab States, considerable efforts have been made to develop scientific and technical education and to change the attitudes of young people towards manual work. Linkages between schools and enterprises have been developed where possible. In several countries, high priority is given to integrated rural development projects with a view to revitalizing and modernizing agriculture.

Co-ordination and adjustment are, however, more often attained by a combination of top-down decisions with ad hoc implementation than as a result of co-ordinated policies.

In several Asian countries, the situation in this respect is not very different. Thus a report from Malaysia voices doubts as to the ability of the central government to give firm direction to the future educational and economic development. In Viet Nam, despite enormous difficulties the central government seems more confident as to its role. A strong will to equip each region with its own means for mastering its educational and economic development is the most striking expression of this confidence. In Pakistan, past attempts to integrate or co-ordinate manpower and economic planning have not been very successful. Both policies operate on totally different philosophies and are treated in almost total isolation from each other. The need for co-ordination is recognized, but the chances that much will be achieved are judged poor. In China the picture looks more positive, due mainly to the role of the powerful State Education Commission and its possibilities for effective co-ordination of education and economic policies. Integrated rural development projects are important in its strategy. Bangladesh and Sri Lanka provide other examples of promising attempts to come to grips with the co-ordination problem despite enormous structural difficulties and a history of mixed success and failure. In both countries, demographic growth frustrates and cancels out much if not all the achievements attained by economic and education policies.

Information concerning Africa is poor. The impression prevails that the economic crisis hit the African countries just as the first timid steps were being taken towards co-ordinating education and economic policies and that whatever had been achieved is now at risk. The tasks of providing primary and junior secondary schooling to all young people and, at the same time, ensuring the necessary scientific and technical training to a more select group have not been satisfactorily solved in most countries. Overall co-ordination between education and economic policies is at present an illusory objective; the best that can be worked for is 'piecemeal social engineering'.

EDUCATION POLICIES AND CULTURE AND COMMUNICATION POLICIES

More than any other concept, cultural policy has many connotations. Culture has to do with norms and values, with national heritage and with popular and 'high' cultural products and manifestations. Industrial economies have generated an 'industrial culture', the technological society generates a new 'technological culture'. The emergence of a society in which services and communications occupy an all-overwhelming place will profoundly transform the cultural scene of the DCs; it will also affect that of the developing countries.

The preservation and transmission of the cultural heritage and traditional values and ethics that sometimes seems to be the core of cultural policy is bound to be a lost cause if it is not part of a cultural policy that succeeds in attaining a blend of old and new, in integrating new developments into the existing moulds. This is what most developed countries have more or less successfully attempted to do in the age of industrialization and what the developing countries are attempting to do now.

But the many connotations of the term 'culture' and the many objectives of cultural policy make it difficult to identify clear policy directions. 'The delineation of culture as a field of policy is also more diffuse than that of education' (Eide, 1986, p. 10). It must also be recognized that cultural objectives are pursued by other policy sectors. The overlap is sometimes such that one may query the justification of cultural policy per se.

In most developing countries cultural policy has a short history and little autonomy. After independence, the crucial importance of cultural policy for forging a country's own national and cultural identify was generally recognized. Culture is at the core of national development. According to Joof, if we accept that 'education is an integral aspect of and subordinated to culture which in turn is an essential factor of development . . . it would seem logical that cultural policies should first be articulated from which it is reasonable to expect education and other policies to derive their direction and strength' (Joof, 1986, p. 19).

Theory and practice are, however, only vaguely related. In most developing countries, cultural policy as a special sector of policy-making is not, or not firmly, established. The reason is, indeed, that 'cultural policy' is almost identical to 'forging national identity' and hence cannot be entrusted to a special Ministry; it pervades national development plans; it guides, at least in principle, socio-economic and science-technology policies, as well as

communication. Concrete cultural policy formulation is often the responsibility of the Minister of Education. The overlap of education with ethical, moral and religious values and traditions entails the inclusion of religious affairs in the mandate of the Minister of Education, a situation surviving in some Northern European countries (Eide, 1986.).

Speaking of co-ordination of education and cultural policies takes on a special connotation in this context: 'intrasectoral', or in-house co-ordination, within the Ministry of Education. Two main strategies are often mentioned. The first concerns the national language(s) and strengthening its (or their) position in education, usually as the vehicular languages of primary and junior secondary education. The implementation of this strategy implies a linguistic policy with all that it means in terms of linguistic research, production and dissemination of software, etc., a task beyond the reach of many countries' own resources.

The second strategy involves support for popular and professional art within both formal and non-formal education. The objective is here the 'democratization' of culture in the wake of the preservation of the national heritage and values.

In those countries with a separate Ministry of Culture intersectoral co-ordination with education is often not a problem: the educational aspects of culture remain in the mandate of education. Co-ordination with non-formal education may be necessary on behalf of the Ministry of Culture. This development is more typical for the Arab States than Africa where separate Ministries of Culture are the exception and where the volume of educational and cultural activities is much less important.

The Asian situation is rather different. National cultures have on the whole survived colonial rule, where it existed. They have, on the other hand, shown an amazing capacity of absorption and adaptation towards outside (usually Western) influences. The conflict between old and new therefore arises less often than elsewhere.

This does not mean, however, that little value is attached to the preservation and promotion of national values. Ethical, cultural and religious principles are often blended with this objective to the point of total identification. Education is assigned a central role in promoting national unity, especially in those countries where different ethnic groups and different languages cohabit, as in Malaysia. National language is a key instrument for this co-ordinated educational/cultural policy; instruction in moral, ethical and civic values also occupies a very important place in curricula.

EDUCATION POLICIES AND COMMUNICATION POLICIES

New communication systems represent a new and formidable challenge for education and cultural policies in the developing countries. The challenge will be greater and the task more difficult as a function of the country's vulnerablity to the penetration of external cultural influences and its poverty in scientific and technological rsources. African countries are most exposed; many Asian countries have already demonstrated their capacity to cope with the challenge. As far as traditional media (radio, press, sometimes television) are concerned, the breakthrough took place some time ago. It is the second-generation systems, in particular the computerized systems, that concern us here. Except for the reserved domain of the international corporations, the computer has not yet made its appearance in education, or in public and private administration. Data collection and processing as well as the dissemination of information are on the whole still handled in a relatively old-fashioned way.

This makes discussion on co-ordination of education with communication policies somewhat abstract. Nevertheless, all developing countries are aware of the challenge, as they are aware of the threat posed by hardware and software, produced outside their control and mostly outside their borders, to existing State monopolies.

Few developing countries have already defined a national policy of information and communication and few have established political and administrative structures for dealing with the issue. Benin's Ministry of Information and Communication ha set up a series of national, provincial and district organizations. In the United Republic of Tanzania a clearcut national communications policy is lacking and only 'various guidelines, principles, articles or charters emanating from parliamentary acts, resolutions passed by the party Organs . . . and pronouncements by Key Party and Government officials' exist (Joof, 1986, p. 12). In most countries the awareness exists and the principles have been laid down, but policy definition lies in the future.

Nevertheless, some headway has been made in integrating new communications systems into the education policy-making and planning machinery, in particular for management and planning purposes where the need was most pressing.

Several regional agencies have been created that can assist countries in this task. Thus the Department of Documentation and Information of the Arab League Educational, Cultural and Scientific Organization (ALECSO) fulfils a series of tasks in this domain (Technical Consultation . . . , 1986*c*, p. 23).

Other efforts to co-ordinate education and communication matters merit the more modest term of 'collaboration'. They are 'more often than not done in a haphazard and unsystematic manner' and emerge 'from the voluntary disposition of collaborating partners' (Joof, 1986, p. 15). This harsh judgement applies to several African countries. Available information on the Arab States is too scarce for appreciation. In Asia, the situation differs considerably between countries and a general statement would be unwarranted.

The communication issue is closely related to

education and cultural policies. Logically speaking, it should be treated under these two headings, perhaps primarily under cultural policy. In the present state of cultural policy in most developing countries, however, this would run the risk of not be treating it the required level of scientific and technical competence. On the other hand, entrusting it to a separate Ministry of communication could isolate it from cultural and, perhaps, education policy. A better solution may be to create a special office that maintains close relations with Culture and Education and, of course, with Economy. Exchanging experiences of administrative solutions already in existence would be highly recommendable.

EDUCATION POLICIES AND SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY POLICIES

All developing countries acknowledge the crucial importance of the development of their own scientific and technological resources. The challenge faced is the optimization of often limited material resources compared with the abundant manpower supply. The role of education in training the latter in the necessary skills is in this respect vital.

Most developing countries depend primarily on import for finished technical products. In many, some goods are produced by multinational and transnational companies and national science and technology has had to start from almost nothing, without the support and the incentives existing in more developed countries. The required scientific and technical skills often cannot be mobilized owing in part to the brain-drain to developed countries.

A third important obstacle that has often crippled efforts is the sheer magnitude of the material investment required for even a modest start in any field of advanced scientific research or technological development.

Education and training systems were not geared to the task of preparing young people for research and development work in science and technology. Science and technical education had to be introduced, the latter often against the wishes of parents, teachers and short-sighted policy-makers and administrators. Teachers had to be trained, but there were no trainers and no programmes, let alone laboratories and workshops.

Considerable progress, requiring co-operation and co-ordination between specialists and administrators from different fields and sectors, has been made in most developing countries. Many of the efforts were begun before policy co-ordination was put on the international and national political agendas.

It has taken most developing countries much time, effort and persuasion to give science and technology their deserved place in education, and the task is far from compete. Education policy had, and often still has, other priorities: guaranteeing the provision of universal basic education and of mass junior secondary education, ensuring mass literacy, responding to the rapidly-growing demand for higher education.

In many countries, science and technology had to reckon with prejudice against manual work, sometimes going back to the times of slavery, and preference for literary and humanistic studies and professions, attitudes that are very difficult to change, especially in countries with an Islamic tradition and in formerly colonized countries.

Most progress has been made in introducing vocation and technical training programmes at the secondary and higher level; prestigious higher technical institutions have been created. In general secondary education, science options have opened the way to science studies in higher education.

Attempts have been made to integrate academic and technical studies in the technical programmes. Other countries mention attempts to strengthen attitudes towards work by connecting education with life (Bahrain). In Morocco, technology is introduced in the curriculum of the first level of secondary education in order to motivate students to continue in the technical professions.

The links between education and work remain far from satisfactory. Scientific and technical studies at the upper secondary level are often too theoretical and laboratory and workshop experience considered as below one's dignity, creating a new gap between engineers and technicians on the one hand and skilled workers on the other. Progress is also often hampered by lack of professional and material resources for science and technical education.

Co-ordination between education and scientific and technological policies is not often mentioned as a special concern, whereas many country reports make mention of serious co-ordination difficulties. Here lies a task of not only creating awareness at the level of national administrations, but also of providing appropriate co-ordination structures. In some countries, such arrangements have indeed been created. Thus in Kenya, a Ministry of Education, Science and Technology was created in 1983; a National Council for Science and technology already existed. The Council 'not only became the main body for evolving and co-ordinating policies related to education, science and technology in Kenya, it served as a link between policy-makers on the one hand and scientists and professionals on the other' (Joof, 1986, p. 14). Several Arab States, 'have created special machinery to supervise and develop the technical education . . . generally linked to the Ministry of Education and often other relevant Ministries' (Kotite, 1986, p. 6).

The existence of co-ordinating mechanisms does not necessarily mean co-ordinated policies. 'Despite the cogent rationale as well as impressive and forceful arguments proposed and advanced in the various studies for coordination of education and other sectoral policies, how in concrete terms this should be realistically and effectively ensured remains by and large in the realm of theory.' (Joof, 1986, p. 31).

As compared with most African countries, Asia presents on the whole a picture of much more

advanced and sophisticated scientific and technological policies and achievements. This does not mean that no obstacles or resistance exist. The major problems in this region are threefold. First, literary and humanistic studies are overdeveloped to the detriment of manual and technical studies. Next, most countries, faced initially with the virtual absence of indigenous science and technological activity, were totally dependent on import. The survival and the inherent strength of simple technology in agriculture and some crafts provided a basis of skill and experience that has contributed to more advanced scientific and technological development. Third, educational priorities for the promotion of science and technology had to compete with equally pressing tasks such as mass primary schooling and adult literacy programmes. These aims having been attained in most countries, priority is now given to science and technology.

In many Asian countries strong government support has been given to the furthering of science and technology. The weak spot remains in many cases the education system. The level and volume of the efforts in secondary education have often remained below what is needed, owing in part to inadequate workshop and laboratory equipment. Lack of money only partly explains this. It is also due to dependence on imported equipment, badly adapted to teaching conditions in the local schools and for which teachers have not been trained.

The reduction of education budgets has in several cases seriously damaged ongoing efforts. Thus the report for Viet Nam mentions that this has resulted in the degradation of the quality of education. The solution is sought in a variety of ways, including non-formal technical and vocational education, at both initial education and upgrading levels. Contracts between schools and production bases are encouraged to ensure improved linkage between education and work and to reduce the financial burden of schools by making use of the training facilities of the enterprises. Education and manpower planning are re-oriented towards local and district needs.

5. Power and decision-making: the political context

Policy-making has three indispensible instruments at its disposal: legal, financial and informative. In most developing countries only the first two have been developed; financial means are often far below what is needed for the implementation of the legal dispositions. Information is the weak spot in most developing countries policies.

Considerable efforts have been undertaken to remedy this shortcoming: mass media make decisions taken at the central level widely known. But the flow of information from the 'grassroots' to the top as well as the dissemination downwards of the data and reasons behind central political decisions have on the whole been neglected. A two-way flow of information is needed firmly anchor political power in society. Without this, decisions taken at the top risk being out-of-touch with reality and either applied in ways incompatible with their intent or not applied at all.

Accompanying the tide against excessive reliance on the legal and financial instruments of policy-making there is a widespread demand in developing countries for more information and increased participation at all levels of society, together, together with the awareness that the 'real' work has to be done at the 'workfloor' level. For education, this means the school and the class.

To this must be added the exponential growth of information mainly produced outside the developing countries that literally over their heads reaches the population. The developing countries must reckon with an increased flow of externally-produced information to parents, teachers and pupils, influencing their behaviour and expectations.

In education policy-making and planning, increased professionalization has enhanced the role of data analysis, of research results and of feedback evaluation on decision-making. Important policy decisions may still be the result of power relations, but they more and more often attain legitimacy through the results of research and analysis. The importance of accountability and, more recently, of the so-called 'quality debate' give evidence of this development. Credibility demands a scientific or quasi-scientific source of legitimacy.

The demand for policy co-ordination must be seen against this background, originating in part within central administrations as a reaction to internal evaluation of the efficacy of sectoral administration and in part in response to external political pressure. Interdepartmental co-ordination has grown exponentially in developed countries. But it has often not met expectations. The demand was for more than token co-ordination of bureaucratic procedures and for a tangible reduction of bureacracy. Outside critics wanted a real breakthrough, a breakdown of sectoral barriers and a re-distribution of political and administrative responsibilities. New domains of policy-making such as health, environmental issues and problems of minorities have contributed to 'problem-oriented' and hence intersectoral policy-making.

Policy co-ordination experience has often been negative. At the central administrative level, it often appeared to be more costly and to require more time than sectoral approaches and therefore lost credibility with politicians and the public.

At the lower levels, co-ordination often needed no formal legitimation. It imposed itself in the day-to-day reality and developed spontaneously. Institutionalization of procedures more often than not confirmed already existing situations. This had

the great advantage that the 'human factor', the willingness of partners to work together, was assured beforehand.

One of the consequences of the present economic crisis is that policies operate in a shorter time-scale. Owing to the importance of demographic data for education policy, the effects of this trend have been less marked in education than elsewhere. Policies have changed as a result of the loss of credibility of forecasts about future developments and of their reduced time-scale. The overall result has been a greater measure of uncertainty and a growing loss of control of at least central policy-making over national development. Policy co-ordination is one way to reduce this uncertainty and to regain credibility.

These trends haave not yet affected policy-making in developing countries to the same extent as in the developed countries. But they have probably increased the discrepancy between long-term central planning and policy-making and short-term policy implementation. The long-term education planning horizon conflicts with the short-term horizon within which national development policies are forced by rapid international fluctuations in the economic and financial domains to operate.

Educational administrations in many developing countries have not yet adapted to this new situation and it can be argued that too rapid adaptation is perhaps not desirable.

Situating policy co-ordination in this context is not easy. Uncertainty on the part of sectoral policy-makers should in principle induce them to seek co-ordination with their counterparts in other sectors. However, they may develop a defensive attitude in particular if policy co-ordination results in budgetary savings. Budgetary restrictions may also directly affect co-ordination: co-ordination mechanisms are likely to be the first victims if money is to be saved because they cannot count on firm support from the established sectoral administrations. For co-ordination to be reinforced in times of crisis, the co-ordinative mechanisms must have a strong power position in central administrations and/or strong support at the highest political level, as is the case in Kenya and Pakistan.

6. Experience gained and lessons learned

MEASURING AND EVALUATING THE RESULTS OF CO-ORDINATION

Policy evaluation has only recently received serious attention. Policy-making is as much an art as a science, and the 'art' dimension at least cannot readily be submitted to a scientific-rational analysis.

Policy making and implementation involve many actors, take place in complex and rapidly changing environments and stretch over relatively long periods. Their effects may overflow into other, perhaps unexpected, domains and there may inversely be overflow from other sectors. It is thus virtually impossible to discern the specific effects of one single policy. Scientific evaluation of education policies in particular carries the risk of missing out much of what has been achieved. Nevertheless, the demand for policy evaluation is growing rapidly and education policy-makers and practitioners would be ill-advised to ignore it.

Theoretical and methodological problems are not the only obstacles. Essential data are often unavailable or imprecise. Policy objectives are rarely stated clearly and changes in objectives, frequent as they are, unregistered. The distant time-horizon of education policies imposes continuous changes in objectives and implementation instruments, eventually complicating the task of evaluation even more so.

A further factor to be considered is the source of legitimacy of education policy evaluation. Policy-makers demand evaluation in the short term and more often than not they are only interested in 'good' results. Their standards often conflict with those of the professional evaluators.

In the developed countries independent or semi-independent institutions for education policy evaluation have been created recently. Their reports are probably among the best material on the evaluation of education policies available at present. But such systematic and institutionalized policy evaluation demands a volume of professional and material investment beyond the capacities of most developing countries.

Measurement and evaluation of the effects of policy co-ordination is fraught with problems, raised to the power of two as regards the evaluation of the outcomes of the sectoral policies involved. This does, however, not imply that evaluating policy co-ordination is impossible. Such an attitude is unwise and self-defeating; there are good arguments for the inclusion of evaluation in any policy co-ordination project.

Policy co-ordination usually centres on specific, more or less precise aspects of policy-making pertaining to several sectoral policies or for whose attainment several policies need to be mobilized. Thus co-ordination between education and communication policies may centre on mutual adjustment concerning data processing, in particular by means of computers. A precise objective common to both sectors and requiring co-ordination, in the production of hardware and software for instance, is to make pupils familiar with the use of computers. The attainment of such tangible objectives can be measured, provided measurable intermediary and terminal targets are set and agreement reached on precise evaluation procedures.

This requires building evaluation into the co-ordination process and making available the

necessary competence and resources. These precautions are rarely taken. The available documentation gives virtually no indication as to how co-ordination projects are evaluated. Perhaps it is generally thought that special evaluation of co-ordination policy-making is unnecessary and would overlap with sectoral policy evaluation. This is to forget that 'real' co-ordination either re-formulates sectoral objectives or leads to formulating new objectives as one of the outcomes of co-operation and 'working together'.

In addition to policy outcomes, evaluation of co-ordination must include a second dimension. Well-conceived co-ordination has 'second echelon' objectives, enhancing participation in making and implementing policy, promoting willingness and ability to work together towards common goals, facilitating reaching consensus on ways and means as well as on targets and furthering the development of common frames of reference. It can be argued that co-ordination should concentrate on these intermediary goals, which also include better management of personnel and financial resources and re-distribution of responsibilities both between central administrations and between national and sub-national bodies.

The 'audit' of the use of resources is becoming an increasingly important part of any policy co-ordination project. The re-allocation of resources in co-ordinated projects, particularly those involving a re-distribution of roles between national and sub-national administrations, must reflect this concern. There, the re-allocation of personnel and financial resources is often the best and the most tangible criterion of success.

A special place is occupied in evaluation literature by indicators, but the possibility of basing policy evaluation on the construction and use of indicators, or at least of statistical indicators, has not been convincingly demonstrated. However, the potential use of indicators for policy evaluation has probably not yet been fully exploited. Apart from complex methdological problems, their construction requires an investment very few developing countries are able or willing to make. The construction of indicators for the evaluation of intersectoral or co-ordinated policies is even more complex and demanding. Nevertheless, some interesting examples of indicators for integrated welfare or social policies (Japan, the Netherlands) are available. Nowhere has the approach been entirely successful or satisfactory, if only because the specific effect of co-ordination or integration has not been singled out and measured. The possible use of these indicators for correcting or re-directing the co-ordinated policies in question is also unclear.

The construction of social indicators in the larger sense is probably the only way in which systematic social reporting, that is to say, systematic measurement of the evolution of the most essential social sectors in a given society, can proceed.

Another direction offering some perspective, even given developing countries rather limited resources, involves local monitoring systems. Until now however, there has been very little experience and expertise available and what exists has been rather disappointing (Carr-Hill p. 76).

There is much to be said for evaluation which is less scientific, but also less demanding in terms of required expertise and investment. Thus reporting on successful and on failed co-ordination projects would undoubtedly be useful. The available country reports contain much information on policy intents, but very little on processes and outcomes. The reports for the Arab States (Kotite, 1986) and for Africa (Joof, 1986) are more analytical, but suffer from a dearth of analytical data.

A related idea is to organize regional exchange of information on co-ordination. The usefulness of such an idea depends, however, on the quality of the common analytical framework used. A key role in developing such a framework could be played by Unesco.

DILEMMAS AND CONFLICTS

Some of the pitfalls and dilemmas that arise in policy co-ordination have been mentioned. A series of 'major co-ordinatory dilemmas or requirements' that face the developing countries in particular has been analysed elsewhere (Whiston, 1987).

A first issue raised by co-ordination is the question of motivation and incentives: why would those responsible for sectoral policy-making engage in co-ordination, with all the costs and risks that this implies, rather than incorporate new needs into their policies as they wish? Is genuine co-ordination therefore not necessarily imposed from the outside, by authority or by pressure? A simple answer to this is not available. At best, an impression based on the background data can be recorded: authority and external pressure have indeed played a decisive role in many of the co-ordination projects and efforts, but a sustained effort requires other incentives. The choice between authority and consensus is a false alternative. Rather, it designs two stages of the co-ordination process, the initial and the continuation state.

A second question also relates to the temporal perspective. Is co-ordination by nature temporary, meant to be discontinued once the task at hand is completed? If, for example, curricula have been adapted to new developments in science and technology, there is no valid reason for co-ordination to continue unless continuous or at least recurrent adaptation is necessary. Another example is that of the co-ordination between education and manpower needs. In order to achieve mutual adjustment, permanent institutions and structures have been created in most countries, presumably because of the need for permanent consultation and co-ordination.

Not much can be said as to this dilemma on the

basis of the available background information. But it seems that the question of the duration of co-ordination efforts should be raised and determined on good grounds in any co-ordination project.

A subsidiary question concerns whether such continuing co-ordination arrangements between various policy sectors are not doomed to lose their vigour and become bureaucratic, routine exercises. The alternative would be a series of ad hoc co-ordination efforts, perhaps involving a change of persons and of rules, in order to maintain the necessary openness and innovative spirit. But this might have a negative affect on the 'willingness to work together' given so much importance in reports. The latter would rather plead for permanent arrangements, whose tasks might evolve but whose general mandate and overall composition would remain unchanged.

Reference was also made to the possible existence of policy co-ordination's 'hidden agenda', a 'hidden hand', a superior idea or force that guides the overall social and political system. One is in this context tempted to make the *rapprochement* with the concept of overall integrated development. Without necessarily adopting this hypothesis, it seems logical to see policy co-ordination as an attempt to re-construct a unity, lost in sectoral policies, similarly to the purport of interdisciplinary research. Co-ordination is undertaken in response to a demand for wholesale approaches of issues and problems as opposed to bureaucratic divisions marking sectoral policies.

An interesting hypothesis could be developed in the wake of this argument: would not the logical outcome of sectoral policy co-ordination be that they melt into one single policy-making entity, or eventually create a new policy sector, as has indeed happened with new issues such as environment protection and the rights of women?

Tension exists between technical competence required for policy co-ordination on the one hand and broad participation of all concerned parties on the other, which possibly could be avoided at the level of local-communal policy-making where less competence is presumably required and whatever is lacking can be acquired. This seems questionable. At the local level, more and more technical competence is required and the 'scale of magnitude' is constantly on the increase. Thus, the local solution is perhaps only valid for a short time: small communities and small co-ordination projects are doomed to make way for larger ones. As a result, more professionalism will be required and broad participation by non-professionals is bound to suffer.

A further dilemma relates to the issue of rationality *v.* irrationality in policy-making and policy co-ordination. Is co-ordination an attempt to restore a rationality not longer available in sectoral policy-making? How does this relate to the rationality of 'overall integrated development'? It can also be argued that the demand for policy co-ordination is based on the opposite reasoning, that is, to give its rightful place to the irrational human factors discarded in sectoral policy-making. Of course, the contradiction could be solved by 'rationalizing' the human factor and hence introducing a new rationality incorporating the irrational. The hypothesis is tempting, but the least that one can say is that the task is enormous and the conditions for constructing such a new rationality seem far from being met.

Finally, a dilemma that seems too important to leave out: the co-ordination of sectoral policies implies a mutual adjustment of the time dimensions that characterize each of them. Education's long-term perspective would thus in all likelihood have to be accelerated to keep pace with scientific and technological development and with economic development. Is there a price to pay for this acceleration of the rate of change? In particular, would it not benefit ephemeral and utilitarian purposes, to the detriment pedagogical objectives long considered essential to education? The question is not new. It has haunted relations between education and economic development since the beginning of industrialization. It is rather the increased pressure and the request for almost instant adaptation to new developments that gives rise to concern.

Conclusions

In most developing countries the demand for co-ordinating sectoral policies is recent. It is, however, increasing exponentially and ways and means will have to be found to meet it. In principle, developing countries could profit from the lengthy and very rich experience acquired in the developed countries. It remains to be seen whether this experience will be of much use. One problem is that it has not been systematically assessed, partly owing to methodological difficulties that evaluation of such abstract matters as policy co-ordination encounters and partly because much of it is inter-departmental co-ordination that has become part of the bureaucratic routine. A more serious problem is the degree of relevance of developed countries experience for developing countries. In all likelihood this would be very low. The conditions in which policies are made and implemented differ profoundly. The fields with which co-ordination on behalf of education is mainly sought, economic development, science and technology, and culture and modern communications, are with the exception of culture, strongly dependent upon outside influences.

More profit can be drawn from a well-conceived exchange of experience on policy co-ordination between developing countries. South-South exchange in this may matter be much more useful than North-South exchange.

For this to be useful, however, experience needs to be studied and analysed. We have pleaded for a not too rigorous approach that would make use of an analytical framework that needs to be developed. A plea is made for Unesco to play a leading role in creating the methodological and organizational conditions making such an exchange possible and fruitful.

A second conclusion is that policy co-ordination is not a neutral, harmless enteprise; it may have negative effects. Thus it has been suggested that development destroys the existing integrated tissues of society. In our view, co-ordination, instead of restoring lost unity, risks to further divide. Often, the creation of co-ordinating bodies results in the virtual withdrawal of part of education policy-making. High-level science and technology are a case in point. The same may happen with part of the economic training tasks of education. The United Kingdom's experience concerning technical and vocational training is highly relevant here.

A more general conclusion is that co-ordination, in particular for education, may be a double-edged sword. Powerful outside pressure on education to co-ordinate its policy with the economy and with scientific and technological development comes at a time when education sees much of its support and power slipping away. Major decisions are in fact taken elsewhere and co-ordination is one of the instruments through which education is divested of its grip over some of the most advanced and economically most interesting programmes.

A further and final conclusion relates to the policy-making process as such. At various places above, attention has been drawn to the time scale of education policy-making compared to policy-making in other fields. It may be useful to explore this issue in greater depth.

Policy processes not only take time; they also change over time. They go through a series of successive steps, from initial pressure on government to evaluation of implementation and results. In the available documentation, very little is said about the stage or stages in the policy-making process at which co-ordination with other policies should best take place.

Parallel to this, policies also have a 'life-cycle'. They may over time lose appeal, but nevertheless survive for many years. Some are short-lived, probably responding to a need that itself rapidly became less urgent. Some have been at the centre of the policy scene for many decades and do still not show signs of fatigue.

Policy co-ordination must take these facts into account. Unfortunately, information of this kind is virtually non-existent. It may well be that developing countries policies in this respect are very different from developed countries and for this reason alone models of policy-co-ordinatation cannot be transplanted.

A final conclusion concerns the weight of demography: its impact on the development of the developing countries is overwhelming yet it appears to be a forgotten sector in policy co-ordination reports. It has educational implications that need to be spelled out, which has been done in a few cases involving timid attempts to co-ordinate between educational and demographic policies.

Reference and background documents

Ahmad, H.; Marimuthu, T.; Ismail, N. 1987. *Interface of Education with Employment and Leisure in the Context of Alternative Futures: Malaysia.* Bangkok, Unesco Principal Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific.

Carr-Hill, R. 1986. *Methods and techniques for the formulation of interdisciplinary plans and policies and the implementation of integrated programmes and projects in the educational sector.* Paris, Unesco. 91 pp. (ED.86/WS/98.)

Eide, K. 1986. *Integrating educational and cultural planning: a synthesis of experiences in the Nordic countries.* Paris, Unesco. 53 pp. (ED.86/WS/79.)

Iwaki, H.; Hamano, Y. 1985. *Interface between Education and Communication: Japan.* Bangkok, Unesco Principal Regional Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific.

Joof, M. B. 1986. *Draft. Co-ordination of education policies with those for culture, communication, science and technology. A Synthesis/Summary.* Dakar, Unesco. 35 pp.

Kotite, P. 1986. *The co-ordination of education policies and plans with those in the fields of science, technology, culture and communication. A survey of experiences in countries of the Arab Region.* Paris, Unesco. 71 pp. (ED.86/WS/97.)

Pelc, K. I. 1986. *Co-ordinating forecasts and policies of technological, employment and educational development: experiences in Poland.* Paris, Unesco. 39 pp. (ED.86/WS/96.)

Regional Training Workshop on Interrelations between Demographic, Technological and Socio-Cultural Factors in the Process of Educational and Employment Planning. Alma, Ata, 1987. 1987*a*. *Country paper on educational policy co-ordination and integrated planning for educational and human resources development of Viet Nam*, by Nguyen Dahn Cao. Paris, Unesco. 12 pp.

Regional Training Workshop on Interrelations between Demographic, Technological and Socio-Cultural Factors in the Process of Educational and Employment Planning. Alma, Ata, 1987. 1987*b*. *Country paper on educational policy co-ordination and integrated planning for educational and human resources development. Sri Lanka*, by D. Gunaratne. Paris, Unesco. 29 pp.

Regional Training Workshop on Interrelations between Demographic, Technological and Socio-Cultural Factors in the Process of Educational and Employment Planning. Alma, Ata, 1987. 1987*c*. *Educational policy co-ordination and integrated planning for human resources deelopment in Bangladesh*. by Dr. Salehuddin Ahmed. Dhaka, Centre on Integrated Rural Development for Asia and the Pacific (CIRDAP). 26 pp.

Regional Training Workshop on Interrelations between Demographic, Technological and Socio-Cultural Factors in the Process of Educational and Employment Planning. Alma, Ata, 1987. 1987*d*. *Educational policy co-ordination and plan integration in China*, by Li Zhibao. Paris, Unesco. 12 pp.

Regional Training Workshop on Interrelations between Demographic, Technological and Socio-Cultural Factors in the Process of Educational and Employment Planning. Alma, Ata, 1987. 1987*e*. Japanese country paper on educational policy co-ordination and integrated planning for educational and human resources development, by Kikuo Nishida. Paris, Unesco. 20 pp.

Regional Training Workshop on Interrelations between Demographic, Technological and Socio-Cultural Factors in the Process of Educational and Employment Planning. Alma, Ata, 1987. 1987*f*. *Need for new education policy and human resource development in India*, by Gopal Gupta. Dhaka, Centre on Integrated Rural Development for Asia and the Pacific (CIRDAP).

Regional Training Workshop on Interrelations between Demographic, Technological and Socio-Cultural Factors in the Process of Educational and Employment Planning. Alma, Ata, 1987. 1987*g*. *Pakistan Country Paper on Educational policy co-ordination and integrated planning for educational and human resource development* by Dr. Abdul Ghafoor. Paris, Unesco. 29 pp.

Reiff, H.; Khan, Q. 1986. *The co-ordination of education policies and the integration of education plans with those for science, technology, culture and communication (Reflections on method and an annotated bibliography)*. Paris, Unesco. 79 pp. (ED.86/WS/28.)

Technical Consultation on the Co-ordination of Education Policies and Plans with those in the Fields of Technology, Culture and Communication, Paris, 1986. 1986*a*. *Draft Programme and Annotated Agenda*, Paris, Unesco. 25 pp. + annexes. (ED-86/WS/101.)

Technical Consultation on the Co-ordination of Education Policies and Plans with those in the Fields of Technology, Culture and Communication, Paris, 1986. 1986*b*. *Etats et acteurs sociaux dans l'articulation des politiques et plans de l'éducation, de la culture et de la communication (une réflexion sur la situation dans les pays industrialisés)* by Isidor Chenesky. Paris, Unesco. 20 pp. (ED.86/WS.93.)

Technical Consultation on the Co-ordination of Education Policies and Plans with those in the Fields of Technology, Culture and Communication, Paris, 1986. 1986*c*. *Methods and Techniques for Co-ordinating Educational Policies and Plans with those in the Area of Information Technology*, by John Wood. Paris, Unesco. 36 pp. (ED-86/WS.94.)

Technical Consultation on the Co-ordination of Education Policies and Plans with those in the Fields of Technology, Culture and Communication, Paris, 1986. 1986*d*. *Methods and Techniques for Co-ordinating Educational Policies and Plans with those in the Fields of Science and Technology: A Synthesis*, by Gerhard Kutsch. Paris, Unesco. 40 pp. (ED.86/WS.95.)

Unesco. 1986. *Approved Programme and Budget for 1986-1987*, Paris, Unesco. (23C/5 Approved.)

Whiston, Dr. G. 1987. *On the Co-ordination of education policies and plans with those for science and technology*. Paris, Unesco.

Zhilitsov, E. et al. 1986. *Analytical study of the interrelations between demographic, technological and socio-cultural factors in the process of educational and employment planning in the Kazakh SSR*. Paris, Unesco. 75 pp. (ED.86/WS/100.)

ED/EPP's "REPORTS, STUDIES" WORKING SERIES

Unesco's Division of Educational Policy and Planning (ED/EPP) reproduces selected technical papers in the present "Reports, Studies" working series with the aim to disseminate information and ideas on current issues of interest to educational policy-makers, planners, administrators and school architects. Papers are distributed on request to Unesco programme specialists and to interested technical personnel in governmental and private institutions.

Most of the papers in the series were originally prepared for one of the Division's study projects, meetings or conferences, and have been selected because of their topical interest. The opinions expressed in the papers are those of the author and do not necessarily represent the views or policies of Unesco. The reader should also bear in mind that many of the papers are working documents, unedited, and are not intended for public distribution. Thus, linguistic deficiencies are evident in some papers, due to the fact that the author has written in a language other than his or her mother tongue.

The series includes two general types of papers: (i) those focusing on the education system or some educational problems in a particular country (numbered C.1, C.2, etc.) and (ii) those treating a subject with a broader or indefinite geographical context (numbered S.1, S.2, etc.). The current list of titles, which contains an index by country and by general subject, may be obtained from the address at the bottom of this page. Comments on the series and on particular papers are most welcome.

SERIE DE DOCUMENTS DE TRAVAIL "RAPPORTS, ETUDES" DE ED/EPP

La Division des politiques et de la planification de l'éducation (ED/EPP) de l'Unesco reproduit certains documents techniques dans la série "Rapports, Etudes" afin de diffuser des informations et des idées relatives aux problèmes courants auxquels doivent faire face les décideurs, les planificateurs et les administrateurs de l'éducation ainsi que les architectes scolaires. Ces documents sont distribués sur demande aux spécialistes de l'Unesco et aux cadres techniques intéressés d'institutions gouvernementales et privées.

La plupart des documents de cette série ont été à l'origine préparés pour des programmes d'études de la division, des réunions ou des conférences et ont été sélectionnés en fonction de l'actualité du sujet traité. Les idées exprimées sont celles des auteurs et ne reflètent pas nécessairement les vues et politiques de l'Unesco. Les lecteurs doivent également tenir compte du fait qu'il s'agit souvent de documents de travail inédits qui ne sont pas destinés au public. De plus, certains auteurs ont rédigé leur document dans une langue qui n'est pas la leur, ce qui explique quelques faiblesses linguistiques.

Cette série se divise en deux catégories de documents : (1) ceux qui ont trait au système éducatif, ou à un aspect particulier de l'éducation dans un pays donné (numérotés C.1, C.2, etc.) et (2) ceux qui traitent d'un sujet dans un contexte géographique plus large ou non défini (numérotés S.1, S.2, etc.). La liste actualisée des titres, qui contient un index par pays et par sujets, peut être obtenue à l'adresse ci-dessous. Tout commentaire éventuel sur cette série et sur chacun des documents serait apprécié.

SERIE DE DOCUMENTOS DE TRABAJO "INFORMES, ESTUDIOS" DE ED/EPP

La División de Políticas y de Planificación de la Educación (ED/EPP) de la Unesco está reproduciendo ciertos documentos técnicos en su serie "Informes, Estudios" con el propósito de difundir informaciones e ideas relativas a los problemas cotidianos con que se encuentran los que toman las decisiones, los planificadores y los administradores de la educación así como los arquitectos escolares. Estos documentos se envían por pedido expreso a los especialistas de la Unesco y a los funcionarios técnicos de las instituciones gubernamentales o privadas.

La mayor parte de los documentos de esta serie han sido preparados para estudios de la División, para reuniones o conferencias y se ha procedido a su selección de acuerdo a la actualidad del tema que se analiza. Las ideas expresadas son las de sus autores y no reflejan necesariamente las opiniones y políticas de la Unesco. Los lectores deben tener asimismo en cuenta que se trata a menudo de documentos de trabajo ineditos que no están destinados a un público especializado. Por otra parte, conviene destacar que algunos autores han redactado sus documentos en una lengua de trabajo que no es frecuentemente la suya, hecho que explica algunas carencias lingüísticas.

Esta serie se divide en dos categorías de documentos : (1) los que se refieren al sistema educativo o a un aspecto específico de la educación en un país determinado (que se numeran C.1, C.2, etc.) y (2) los que tratan un tema en un contexto geográfico más amplio y menos definido (llevan la sigla S.1, S.2, etc.). La lista actualizada de títulos, que contiene un índice por países y por temas, se puede obtener en la dirección que aparece a continuación. Todo comentario que los lectores consideren útil para esta serie o en relación a un documento en particular será altamente apreciado.

- - - - - - -

EPP/EFD Documentation Centre
UNESCO
Place de Fontenoy
75700 Paris, France

BEST COPY AVAILABLE